

The Classical Review

SEPTEMBER, 1938

NOTES AND NEWS

IRREGULARITY of publication and restriction to the Rumanian language have severely limited the circulation of *La Revista Clasică* since it began its career ten years ago. These handicaps have now been removed; other languages are admitted—it is expected that most of the articles will be in French—and in future the journal will appear at regular intervals. Volume VIII, which was issued this summer, is a Horatian number and contains contributions from three representatives of French scholarship, with which Rumania has close connexions: J. Marouzeau writes on 'La plastique de la phrase et du vers chez Horace', E. Galletier on *Epist.* I. xx and the ancient commentators, and L. Herrmann on the old problem of *Odes* I. xiv. Of the local contributions the two most important are also in French: D. M. Pippidi writes on *A.P.* 309, and the editor, Professor N. Herescu of the University of Bucarest, provides a very full and useful bibliography of Horace. There are also some seventy pages of reviews in Rumanian. The volume promises well for the new régime, and the journal can no longer be neglected by Latinists. The editor asks scholars in other countries to send him copies of their publications for review.

The first number of *Vergilius*, the Bulletin of the Vergilian Society, which appeared in June under the editorship of Professor E. L. Highbarger, includes articles (all in English) by Professor Amadeo Maiuri, Professor F. J. Miller, Miss L. B. Woodruff, Dr. D. Mustilli, and Dr. Olga Elia, and a bibliography of recent work on Virgil by Professor G. E. Duckworth. The Society, which is sponsored by two committees, one in America and one in Italy, intends to publish both technical articles on archaeological and philological questions and popular papers on aspects of Virgil's work and on subjects directly or

indirectly related to it, and hopes to issue at least two numbers a year. The annual subscription is a dollar; correspondence should be addressed to Professor Highbarger at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.

The well-known German periodical *Wörter und Sachen* embarks, with the current number, on a new career as a quarterly. Founded in 1909 as a protest against the isolation of language-study from its cultural background, and long associated with the names of R. Meringer and R. Much and later with those of H. Güntert and W. Meyer-Lübke, it has taken a distinguished place in the field of Indo-germanic studies. The present number includes a lavishly illustrated account of the rock-carvings of the Val Camonica by F. Altheim and E. Trautmann, an article by E. Winkler entitled 'Vom sprachwissenschaftlichen Denken der Franzosen', and another by K. Stegmann von Pritzwald on 'Sprachwissenschaftliche Minderheitenforschung'. In his 'Foreword' the editor, H. Güntert, explains that while the aims of the *Neue Folge* remain in general the same, greater stress will be laid in future on the intimate relations that exist between *Sprache* and *Sprachgemeinschaft*. The changes within any particular speech which have effected its differentiation from other Indo-germanic speeches must (he asserts) be investigated and, if possible, explained, in the light of the history, culture and racial character of its own group of speakers. We trust that in its new dress *Wörter und Sachen* will continue to deserve the attention and respect of scholars.

Bibliotheca philologica classica has shown that it can be improved. Under new editors it seems marvellously exact, and scholarly in many languages; an exception is its persistent accentuation of 'Eschyle'. It has even outgrown the

parsimony which allowed only one initial to a surname, and the 'A. Pickard' of two years ago is now 'A. W.'; nor is the best part of his name suppressed as of yore. Tried on a multiple 'Festschrift', *Apo-phoreta Goto-burgensia* (for which see C.R. LI. 25), Band 63 proves to omit the right items, and to give accurately the authors and titles of the rest, with a helpful note where a title does not speak for itself. But tried on the relevant volume of C.R. (L) it fares ill. Almost every contribution is passed over which was short enough for small type, and, among reviews, even large type is recorded or ignored upon no principle that can be divined. Without good choice of matter, accuracy does not suffice.

Though it has swollen from 236 pages to 314 in the last five years, this bibliographical supplement to 'Bursian' still falls far short of the 471 much fuller pages of *L'Année philologique*, Tome XI. For the great value of the latter work see C.R. L. 84. Two years have added much to its list of 'périodiques dépouillés'. In despoiling C.R. L it nearly succeeds where the *Bibliotheca* fails, but

a few reviews are ignored. Of *Apo-phoreta Goto-burgensia* the editor's knowledge is perhaps second-hand, for her references thereto have several misprints, of which the most mischievous is 'Lingby' for 'Lyngby' (pp. 251, 438). Other noteworthy slips are 'Nicetas' for 'Nicias' (p. 82); the division of S. G. Owen's items between S. G. and 'D. G.'; and 'trissyllabique' (p. 44), which reveals the cloven hoof of 'diss-'. But the book is a gift of the upper gods.

For particulars of both these annuals see below (pp. 157, 159).

Those who are troubled by questions about the accent in Greek and Latin should consult the April number of *Revue de Philologie* (XII. 2, pp. 133-148), where Monsieur L. Laurand gives a sage survey of the issues, from the famous passage in Dionysius of Halicarnassus to the present day, with a careful bibliography of recent books and articles, including some English items which even students in this country may have missed.

ΟΑΤΜΠΙΟΝΙΚΗ.

HIERO, victor at the Pythia in 482 and 478 and at Olympia in 476 and 472, achieved the remarkable distinction of a third Pythian victory in 470. Bacchylides, celebrating this event in his fourth ode, says (vv. 14 ff.) 'we can crown him with wreaths, the man who alone of mortals has won such fame at Delphi, δύο τ' Ὀλυμπιονίκας ἀείδω'. In support of the usual, and natural, assumption that Ὀλυμπιονίκας is from Ὀλυμπιονίκη 'an Olympian victory' is cited Antipho Sophista, Frag. 49 (Diels): ἐπεὶ καὶ Ὀλυμπιονίκαι καὶ πυθιονίκαι καὶ οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἀγῶνες καὶ σοφαί καὶ πᾶσαι ἡδοναὶ ἐκ μεγάλων ληρημάτων ἐθέλουσι παραγίνεσθαι. But for feminine nouns of this formation there is no other evidence in classical literature, and post-classical literature provides only two instances, ἡ πυθιονίκη twice in the *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus. When it is further observed that lexicographers (e.g. Suidas) who gloss Ὀλυμ-

πιονίκης 'an Olympian victor' make no mention of Ὀλυμπιονίκη, it is legitimate to ask whether such feminine nouns are genuine, at any rate in the classical period. Their formation is abnormal. Compound masculine nouns of the first declension in -ης are not uncommon; corresponding feminine nouns, other than proper names, are much rarer, and when they do exist their termination is in -ία (e.g. τεῖχομάχης, τεῖχομαχία). By analogy, therefore, we should expect Ὀλυμπιονικία, etc. Nouns of this form are mostly abstract, whether derived from substantives, adjectives, or verbs (cf. Kühner-Blass II, p. 275), though the use e.g. of ναυμαχία 'a sea-battle' suggests that Ὀλυμπιονικία might have meant 'an Olympian victory'; but even if it is held that so concrete a sense could not properly be attached to a noun in -ία, it does not follow that Ὀλυμπιονίκη could be used instead. To take an exactly parallel formation,

there is no reason to suppose that ἡ Μαραθωνομάχη 'the battle of Marathon' was ever evolved from Μαραθωνομάχης.

The forms used by Bacchylides and Antipho are ambiguous; in the absence of articles to determine the gender they might all be referred to the normal masculines in -ης. Again, if in Antipho the words do mean 'victories at Olympia and Delphi', then καὶ οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἀγῶνες is a very odd continuation; for to compete is not necessarily to win, and the expression 'victories at Olympia and Delphi and such contests' is almost nonsense.¹ In Bacchylides there is no such difficulty; but the singularly poor evidence for the feminine nouns suggests that here, as well as in Antipho, the word should be referred to the form in -ης used, as Pindar uses it, adjectivally. Pindar (*Ol.* III 3) writes Θήρωνος Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ὕμνον ὀρθώσας (cf. *Ol.* VII 88); might not Bacchylides, whose αἰεῖδεν covers the sense of ὕμνον ὀρθοῦν, write Ὀλυμπιονίκας, leaving ὕμνους to be understood?² The lines preceding the passage under discussion are badly preserved, but v. 10 certainly contains ὕμνους, and it may be that its use there was such that to repeat it with Ὀλυμπιονίκας in v. 17 would have been not only unnecessary but even inelegant. In Antipho there is a noun ready to hand—ἀγῶνες. To qualify a noun like

ἀγών by Ὀλυμπιονίκης is to go a step further than Pindar, but since it would not only remove an anomaly but also improve the sense, it seems reasonable to assume that this is what Antipho meant, and to translate 'contests of Olympian and Pythian victors and the like'.

If reinterpretation makes it possible to exclude Ὀλυμπιονίκη, etc. from classical Greek, the error, if it is an error, can only be removed from Heliodorus by emendation; for on both occasions the feminine article is expressed and an adjectival use is out of the question (*IV* 16 τὴν μέλλουσαν πυθιονίκην, *V* 19 τὴν πυθιονίκην ὠνόμαζεν). Emendation is indeed easy; if the second instance stood alone τὴν Πυθοῖ νίκην might be written without hesitation, for the corruption, slight in itself, would be invited by the presence of ὁ πυθιονίκης earlier in the same chapter. But the expression τὴν μέλλουσαν Πυθοῖ νίκην, though not perhaps impossible, seems odd even in Heliodorus. It is probably justifiable to maintain that these ill-formed words found no place in classical literature, but it does not follow that a writer of about the third century A.D. would not coin them if he found them convenient.³ There are not a few words and usages peculiar to Heliodorus, and though there is no clear case where his is the sole authority for a wrong formation, it is safer on the balance to allow that he did write ἡ πυθιονίκη 'the Pythian victory'.

R. M. RATTENBURY.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

¹ This difficulty may be the cause of the solitary gloss on Ὀλυμπιονίκη, which appears in the Lexicon Hauniense (Gaisford's Etymologicum Magnum s.v. Ὀλύμπια): 'Ὀλυμπιονίκη, ἡ πανήγυρις, καὶ 'Ὀλυμπιονίκης, ὁ γενναῖοτάτος ἢ ὁ στεφθεῖς.

² Bacchylides wrote odes in celebration of each of Hiero's Olympian victories (III and V).

³ It is perhaps significant that for the classical παιδοτριβία, formed from παιδοτριβίης or παιδοτριβεῖν, Byzantine Greek has παιδοτριβή.

GLANIS AND JUVENAL V. 104. (See C.R. LII. 56.)

vos anguilla manet longae cognata colubrae,
aut glacie aspersus maculis Tiberinus, et ipse
vernula riparum, pinguis torrente cloaca
et solitus mediae cryptam penetrare Suburae.

It turns out that neither H. J. Rose nor I may claim the credit for *glanis*: this emendation was put forward tentatively in 1911 by H. W. Garrod (*C.R.* XXV. 240 ff.), who also anticipated Rose in pointing to IV. 42 ff. as a

possible source of the corruption. I now find, however, that at least the germ of the idea was contained in a note of Hadrian Valesius, first published in Achaintre's edition of 1810. On the various suggestions made by this scholar, Ruperti in his edition of 1819 has the following note: '*glarcae* (adversante metro) et *glanii* (qui piscis potius glanis, -idis et glanus dicitur

Plin. 2, 43, 67. 32, 10 et 12 s. 45 et 53) et *gladii* H. Vales.' On *Tiberinus*, further, Valesius makes the comment 'de Tiberino pisce aliqua notavi apud Galenum. . .'. This is the passage of Galen¹ which Bücheler put forward as a new discovery in *Rhein. Mus.* 35, 392 ff.

I seem, however, to have been the first to discuss *glanis* in this connection from an ichthyological point of view,² and as Rose had been led to deny the possibility of *glanis* precisely on ichthyological grounds, perhaps my note may have served some useful purpose. It is the scavenging habits of the *glanis* tribe that lend plausibility to the emendation: it is unlikely that the Romans had two such names both of which resembled *glacie*. But if a future editor of Juvenal includes *glanis* in his text, he must write thereunder 'H. W. Garrod'.

L. R. PALMER.

University of Manchester.

The ingenious conjecture *glanis*, revived by Dr Palmer, though it removes the difficulty as to *glacie*, which involves the untrue and unsupported assumption that fish become spotted through the action of severe cold, is unconvincing, because the *glanis*, whatever specific fish it was, in the Latin of Juvenal's day was certainly a sea fish, not a river fish, for Pliny N.H. XXXII. § 142, after mentioning fish that are found both in the sea and in rivers (*amni ac mari*), continues (§ 145) *peculiares autem maris*, and gives a long catalogue in alphabetical order of fish found only in the sea, among them (§ 148) being *glanis*, *gonger* etc. It is true that Pausanias IV. 34, 2, quoted by Dr Palmer, speaks of γλάεις found

in the rivers Hermus and Maeander: but from Ionia to the Tiber is a far cry, and it is hardly safe to infer from that passage that the *glanis* ascended the Tiber, much less that it penetrated into the foul recesses of the great sewer of Rome.

The *glanis* therefore, I fear, must be dismissed. There is however another solution of the problem which I have long thought to be possibly the true one. *Tiberinus* is certainly used as a *proprium nomen piscis* in the passage of Galen, *de alim. fac.* III. 30 produced by Bücheler, and cited here by Friedländer. It appears thence that *Tiberinus* was the local name at Rome for a particular species of *lupus*. Though the finer sort of *lupus*, which Columella, VIII. 16, 4, calls *fluvialis lupus*, was a luxury fish, Columella moreover states that among fishes to be included in a *vivarium* should be *lupi* without spots, there being also *lupi* having spots: VIII. 17, 8 *tum etiam sine macula (nam sunt et varii) lupos includemus*, i.e. in a *vivarium*. From this it appears that the unspotted *lupus* was placed in the *vivarium* as being the finer sort, while the spotted *lupus* was a coarser variety.

The scholiast's note on 104 *nomen piscis* refers beyond question to *Tiberinus*. This is further established by the glosses *proprium nomen piscis* explanatory of *Tiberinus*, printed by P. Wessner in his important edition of the *Scholia in Iuvenalem vetustiora*, Teubner, 1931, p. 72. Scholia and glosses both indicate that *Tiberinus* was the name of a particular sort of fish at Rome. They do not refer to some other fish whose name is concealed under *glacie*, but to the spotted *Tiberinus lupus*.

What then of *glacie*? It has been established that the ancient original of Juvenal's manuscripts was furnished with explanatory interlinear glosses, and that one of the causes of false readings was that these glosses were sometimes mistaken for corrections and incorporated into the text. A single example will suffice. In vi. 159 *observant ubi festa mero pede sabbata reges*, instead of *mero* the unmetrical reading *nudo*, an obvious gloss, has found its way into the text of the Pithoeanus, and of its closely related manuscript

¹ Garrod accepts Galen's evidence and in writing 'Tiberinus as a proper noun is unsupported from any Latin writer . . .' was apparently unaware of Heraeus' interpretation of *Hist. Aug.* XVII. 17. 5. My case, however, rests on the impossibility of *Tiberinus*; hence I was concerned to show that Galen's evidence is derivative. But if *Tiberinus* was possible as a fish name, then the point about the scholiast's *nomen piscis*, which both Garrod and Rose have made, loses its cogency.

² Garrod writes 'glanis, a kind of shad', a word on which the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* has 'kinds of anadromous deep-bodied fish'.

Parisinus 8072, and of the Oxford manuscript. Of such sort, I think, is *glacie*. It is a gloss designed to explain *aspersus maculis*, which has crept into the text in place of another word. If this be so, then the absurd explanation of *maculis* need no more be credited to Juvenal. It is the product of the glossary-writer, probably his invention, though he may have heard tell of such a popular error. *Glacie* then must go. It must be replaced by a vanished word, a word which is no mere guess of mine, but which Juvenal himself supplies. I mean *manet*. Then we have a satisfactory text

vos anguilla manet longae cognata colubrae,
aut manet aspersus maculis Tiberinus.

The fish which awaits the poor dependent is eel or mottled Tiber pike.

The repetition of the word *manet* is in Juvenal's manner. Sometimes the verb is merely repeated, as iii. 245 *ferit hic cubito, ferit assere duro alter*; vi. 157 *hunc dedit olim barbarus incestae, dedit hunc Agrippa sorori*; vi. 352 *conducit Ogulnia vestem, conducit comites*; sometimes it is repeated with a connecting conjunction as, v. 14 *inputat hunc rex, et quamvis rarum tamen inputat*; viii. 88 *pone irae frena modumque, pone et avaritiae*; ix. 18 *deprendas animi tormenta . . . deprendas et gaudia*; xiv. 116 *his crescunt patrimonia fabris, sed crescunt quocumque modo*. In the present passage the conjunction *aut* is necessary because two alternatives are presented.

S. G. OWEN.

Oxford.

Twice over in the *Historia Animalium* (vi. 568a and ix. 621a) the breeding habits of the fish *Glanis* are described. Its eggs are laid in a tangled skein, somewhat like frog-spawn, and this, made viscid by the milt, clings to willow-roots and suchlike. The eggs grow slowly and the father fish keeps guard for some fifty days, chasing other fishes away and growling the while; if you drag the spawn into shallow water he will follow it up, and if you dangle a hook before him he will bite it to bits. It is the most curious and most detailed account of any single fish in all Aristotle.

The same fish is mentioned elsewhere in the book. The female is the better eating, an unusual circumstance (608a4): the gall-bladder lies upon the liver, as it often does (506b8); the fish has four gills, all double save the last, like perch and carp (505a16); its tail is like a newt's, to compare great things with small (490a5); and it is liable to sunstroke or to thunder-stroke near the rising of the Dogstar (602b22). The last item, which savours of folklore, is copied by Pliny (ix. 25), who ascribes it to Silurus; Pliny also refers to Silurus an account of the paternal custody of the spawn, and tells (ix. 17) of the voracity of Silurus, 'omne animal appetens, equos natantes saepe demergens'. But he uses the name *Glanis* in telling how it breaks the angler's hook (ix. 67), and in speaking (xxxii. 48) of the medicinal virtues of its liver. Aelian (xii. 14) talks of the *φρουρά τῶν βρεφῶν* of *γλάνις*; says that that fish resembles the *σίλουρος*; and adds that it is found in the Strymon, and in the Maeander and certain other rivers of Asia. Belon (*Obs.* i. 55) confirms its occurrence in the Strymon, and calls it *glaignon* or *glanon*, which Salviani (p. 220) calls a 'Byzantine' name. Pausanias puts it in the Nile, incorrectly, but various other catfishes are common there; also in the Rhine, the Ister, the Euphrates and the Phasis, and speaks of it among τὰ μάλιστα ἀνδροφάγα. In Athenaeus (311 f.), *γλάνις* from the Ister is compared with *λάτος*, the gigantic Nile Perch (*Tilapia nilotica*).

Pliny tells of the *Silurus* in the river Main that it grew so big that it had to be hauled ashore by a team of oxen; and the same story told at length by Aelian (xiv. 26) of a huge fish in the Danube refers to the same *Silurus*. Lastly there is a much-discussed passage in Ausonius' *Mosella*, about a gigantic fish, 'mitis balaena Mosellae'. Lorenz Oken, in a learned but little-known essay on the Ausonian fishes (*Isis*, 1845), held that Pliny's *Silurus* was indeed that of Linnaeus, while Ausonius's was the Linnean *Acipenser*, or Sturgeon. But Cuvier, whom I am content to follow, held that Ausonius's great fish, looking like a dolphin (as

Pliny also had said—'porculo marino simillimus'), and shining as though oiled, 'quem velut Actaeo perductum tergora olivo | amnicolam delphina reor', agrees admirably with the true Silurus, and cannot apply to the mail-clad sturgeon at all.

The true Silurus, largest of European fishes except the sturgeons, is the only European species *save one* of the great family of Siluridae or Catfishes. It has a huge head, a smooth skin, and six oral tentacles or barbels, whose resemblance to a cat's whiskers gives the family its name. It is the *Wels* or *Schäide* of the Germans, the *Sheatfish* of English naturalists.

The Wels is a fish of eastern Europe, unknown south of the Alps and Pyrenees. In France it is very rare, and mostly confined to the basin of the Doubs. In Holland also it is rare, but it is still caught from time to time in what is left of the old Haarlemer Meer. It is found in the great lakes of Sweden, and occurs (but of small size) in the rivers of Poland and North Germany. It is common in the Bodensee, very rare in the Upper Rhine, and common throughout the whole basin of the Danube.

More than one commentator had begun to suspect that the Aristotelian account of Glanis did not tally with the great Wels of the Danube. Schneider, in his *Aelian* (*l.c.*), notes: 'Glanin veterum a Siluro Glani Linnaei prorsus diversum putat Cl. Merrem; neque enim conveniunt quae de moribus glandidis tradit Aristoteles atque ex eo Aelianus'. But naturalists, on the whole, regarded the Aristotelian account with scepticism, neglected its apparent discrepancies, and continued to look on Glanis as identical with the Wels. So Cuvier and Valenciennes, in the *Histoire des Poissons* (1839), spoke of Aristotle's account as bordering on the marvellous, and came to the conclusion that 'on ne peut douter que notre silure ne soit le Glanis d'Aristote.'

The story starts afresh with Agassiz. The great ichthyologist knew that the several catfishes vary greatly in their care of the young; that the Wels leaves its spawn untended in a hole in the river-bed, but that some of the N. American

catfishes display peculiar parental care, of which, by the way, Thoreau's *Trip on the Concord* gives us a good description.¹ Agassiz saw, in short, that Aristotle was describing something untrue of the Wels, but characteristically true of certain other catfishes; and in 1856 he succeeded in procuring from the Achelous or Aspro, through his colleague Professor C. C. Felton, professor of Greek at Harvard, specimens of a fish called *γλανίδι*. These fishes—they were only young specimens, under nine inches long—he saw at once to be allied to but distinct from the ordinary Silurus, and he presently described them under the name of *Glanis Aristotelis* in the *Proc. Amer. Acad. of Arts and Sciences* (iii, p. 323, 1857). Agassiz's own account was revised and extended in 1890 by Mr S. E. Garman (*Bull. Essex Inst.*, Salem, xxii, p. 8, 1890), who had charge of the original specimens in the Agassiz Museum at Harvard. He pointed out (*inter alia*) that Glanis had four barbels while the Wels has six—a difference which seems to indicate (according to Dr Gill) that Glanis is nearer related to certain Asiatic species than to the European Wels, and is in fact 'the offspring of a successful invasion from Persia wards and the Orient'. It abounds in the Peneus, according to Apostolides, and is called *γουλανός* at Larissa.

The history of the Glanis is unique in the annals of ichthyology. A more detailed account of its habits was given than of any other fish by the greatest of ancient scientific authors; but the fish itself was lost sight of or confounded with another for more than a score of centuries. As Professor Felton said: 'It is a very striking fact that the fish in question should, so many centuries after the death of Aristotle, have come across the Atlantic to this country, to furnish our associate with a commentary on the great philosopher and to vindicate his accuracy as an observer against the criticism even

¹ For a full account see Theodore Gill, 'Parental Care among Freshwater Fishes', *Smithsonian Inst. Proc.*, 1895; 'The Remarkable Story of a Greek Fish, the Glanis', *ibid.* 1907.

of a Cuvier.' So far as I am aware, no more is known about the Glanis to this day. It remains a rare fish. There may be some in the great fish-collection at Vienna, but the British Museum has never had one.

The Italian fish-fauna is known scientifically at least as well as our own, and judging by the wealth of vernacular names, is much better known than ours to the bulk of the population. Neither Wels nor Glanis nor any other species of the Catfish family has ever been seen, or said to be seen, in Italy. What Salviani said five hundred years ago is still true: 'in nostris vero fluviis nullibi (quod sciam) habetur'. The Wels is the most conspicuous of fishes, and Glanis, like so many American catfishes, is a fish of the clear mountain-streams. That either should lurk unnoticed in the Tiber, that either should poke into Suburan sewers, is out of the question, Mr L. R. Palmer's reading of *glanis* for *glacie* in Juvenal v. 104

is utterly impossible, and has no leg to stand on.

Dr Brunelli, of the R. Laboratorio di Idrobiologia in Rome, tells me that the common eel is *the only fish* which enters the city sewers as Juvenal describes it doing. The line 'aut glacie adpersus maculis', etc., remains as obscure as ever. I begin to think that it may have dropped out of another place, and that we might do without it altogether here:

vos anguilla manet longae cognata colubrae,
vernula riparum, pinguis torrente cloaca
et mediae solita cryptam penetrare Suburae.

The phrase 'glacie adpersus maculis' might well mean wilted, damaged, frosted like a bad potato or a withered apple, and looks indeed more suited to a vegetable than a fish. But I confess I can think of no particular herb or vegetable which the phrase would fit with full propriety.

D'ARCY W. THOMPSON.

University of St. Andrews.

CALLIMACHUS, EPIGRAM 46
(=ANTH. PAL. 12, 150).

7 ἐστ' ἄν' ἡ χάσας ἀφειδέα ποτὶν ἔρωτα
τοῦτ' εἶπαι· κείρεν τὰ πτερά, παιδάριον.

7 χάσας Wilamowitz. 8 τοῦτ' εἶπαι codd.: τοῦτ' εἶπαι Kaibel.

FOR the corrupt *χάσας* read *καχάσας*, 'we can laugh at Love to our hearts' content and tell him to his face', etc. This seems better than to connect *ἀφειδέα* with *ἔρωτα*, as is usually done; the position of the article is against this, and *ἀφειδής ἔρως* can hardly mean 'remorseless Love'.

It is easy to see how *χάσας* might arise from *καχάσας*, which invites syllabic loss: e.g.

καχάσας, the omitted syllable written above the line, or possibly in the margin, being mistaken for a correction of *αν*. The confusion of *κ* and *χ* is, of course, common in Uncial. The scribe, as his practice shows, would be ready to accept a recognizable word, even if unmetrical and unsatisfactory in meaning. It must be admitted that this does not account for the accent; the only advantage of Ruhnken's *καχεστὸς* and A. W. Mair's *χάκαστρά ο'* is that they attempt to meet this difficulty.

There are three certain cases of corruption by loss of a syllable in this ten-line epigram (see Wilamowitz ed. 1907): 2 οὐ καθ' ἡμᾶς for οὐκ ἡμᾶς

ἀμαθής (i.e. οὐκαθής, the missing syllable being inserted in the wrong place); 4 πάνας for πανακίς; 5 τοῦ δοκῶ for τοῦτο δοκῶ (possibly from metrical considerations).

For the *immediate* change of case after *ἀν'* compare O 57 εἴρησι Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι | παυόμενον (παυσάμενον al.) . . . ἰκέσθαι: Aesch. *Agam.* 1610 καλὸν . . . τὸ καταθεῖν ἐμῶ, | ἰδόντα: Thuc. 4, 20, 3 ἔξεστιν ὑμῖν φίλους χειρόσθαι. The poet's motive for choosing *καχάσας* rather than *καχάσας*, supposing it were more than a simple desire for variety, might be that indicated by Monro, *Hom. Gram.* § 240, namely that the participle is felt as an essential part of the predication, which it certainly is here. But in fact from Homer onwards considerable freedom is exercised in the choice of Accusative or Dative in such constructions. See, in addition to Monro, Kühner § 475 and Jebb's notes on *Soph. Ant.* 838 and *Oed. R.* 913.

W. M. EDWARDS.

University of Leeds.

LUCRETIIUS II 43.

si non forte tuas legiones per loca campi
feruere cum uideas belli simulacra cientis,
subsidiis magnis fepicurit constabilitas,
ornatas armis fitastuas pariterque animatas,
feruere cum uideas classem lateque uagari

43 itastatuas O: itastuas O corr.: itasiuas (? itastuas) G: ualidas Lachmann: pariter Bernays: ornatasque . . . statuas Munro: porro Merrill: stlattas Martin (placing 43a [Nonius: 'Lucr. lib. II'] before 42).

For *fitastuas* read *paribus*.

None of the earlier emendations is satisfactory. Martin's *stlattas* has certain merits; but, even if the *stlattae* could be *ornatae armis*,

how could they also be *pariter animatae*? The best suggestion so far is Bernays' *pariter*, though the phrase would not then have much point: 'all alike equipped with arms'.

If we read *paribus*, we might well see a reminiscence of this line in Virgil's *paribusque ornauerat armis* (*Aen.* XII 344). Moreover, without *paribus* or some similar expression, *pariterque animatas* is weak. But, with *paribus*, the whole line will produce a vivid picture

of an army 'acting as one man' (cf. *Aen.* IX 182: *his amor unus erat pariterque in bella ruebant*). For the figure of speech in *paribus pariterque* we may compare *Lucr.* V 1401 f.: *procedere membra mouentis duriter et duro terram pede pellere matrem* and I 734 f.: *inferiores partibus egregie multis multoque minores*.

M. J. BOYD.

Queen's University, Belfast.

REVIEWS

STUDIES OF EARLY GREEK THOUGHT.

1. O. BECKER: *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken*. Pp. viii + 223. (*Hermes*, Einzelschriften, Heft 4.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1937. Paper, RM. 16.

2. W. MARG: *Der Charakter in der Sprache der frühgriechischen Dichtung*. (Semonides, Homer, Pindar.) Pp. iv + 105. (Kieler Arbeiten zur klassischen Philologie, Heft 1.) Würzburg: Triltsch, 1938. Paper, RM. 3.

THESE are two further examples of 'Begriffsforschung', and both are revised versions of dissertations presented for the degree of Ph.D. in 1935, the first at Leipzig, the second at Kiel; but otherwise there is little resemblance between them.

Becker's special interest appears to be in philosophy, and he has studied the 'Bild des Weges' with the prime object of making clear the force of such philosophical technicalities as *ἀπορία* and *μέθοδος*. Beginning with a short discussion of preliminaries (pp. 1-6), the main body of the work falls into two parts: the first (7-39) deals with the words meaning 'way' in four chapters, on *κείμενος*, on *ὁδός*, on *πόρος*, and on the other words (e.g. *ἀτραπός*, *ἀγνυα*, *οἶμος*); the second (41-212) treats 'Der Weg als Denkbild'. After a short chapter on Homeric thought, Becker passes to a full account of the use of 'way'-metaphors in Pindar (who is chosen as the best available representative of pre-philosophic thought), in Herodotus, in three early philosophers (Parmenides, Heraclitus, Empedocles), in Aeschylus and in Sophocles. At the end come two pages of 'Nachträge',

and two indices, the first of 'Namen und Sachen' and the second of passages quoted. This last is apparently complete, and gives an impressive idea of the thoroughness of the work. Becker has chosen to end with Sophocles, partly because he holds that in Euripides these metaphors have become mere formulae, and partly because he regards Plato as Sophocles' immediate successor. The arrangement of the material is exemplary: the first part gives a clear idea of the lexicographical side of the problem, and in the second the new elements in the thought of each author are connected up with previous tendencies in the same direction, so that the development is made clear. This accounts for the shortness of the section on Homer; most of the Homeric material is in the later chapters. The chief disadvantage of the book is that the author's treatment of the metaphysical problem is extremely difficult (I am assured on good authority that even Germans find it so); but the English reader may be assured that the attempt to master these difficulties is well worth making. The best sections appear to me to be those on Pindar, Herodotus, and the philosophers; but the whole work is very careful and full of interesting matter.

Alike in length and in difficulty, Marg's work stands upon another plane. After a short introduction (pp. 1-5), there are three main divisions, the first (6-42) on Semonides' 'Weiberiambos', the second on 'Homerische Ausdrucksweisen im Bereich "Charakter"', and the third (80-99) on 'Der "Charakter"'

in der Dichtung Pindars'. There follow a short 'Ausblick auf die attische Sprache' (100-101, on 'φύναι und πεφύκέναι') and two indices (of 'Wörter und Sachen' and of passages quoted). Of the three main sections of the book, the first is by far the most important. It contains a detailed interpretation of Semonides' 'Satire', followed by a discussion of general questions connected with construction, style, etc. Marg shows that there is good reason for holding that the piece is a unity, and not, as has often been held, two distinct fragments; and he has much that is valuable on the details and on the 'volkstümlich-bäurisch' character of both language and thought. In the two remaining sections he employs Semonides as a foil, to show how different is the attitude of Homer or Pindar towards descriptions of character. In these sections he follows the more normal method of the 'Begriffsforscher', discussing the different words and phrases used by his chosen authors

to denote differences of character. Under Homer, he deals with such words as νόος, θυμός and ἀρετή, and with the part played by the gods in the creation of human character. Under Pindar, he divides his material into three groups: 'Kraft', 'Anlage' and 'Abhängigkeit vom Göttlichen'. In the first, he deals mainly with the difference between Pindar's ideal of the true aristocrat and his account of the character of his opponents; in the second and third, his main subject is φύς. It will be seen from this short account that Marg's work, though slighter in build than Becker's, will also repay study; and, apart from its contents, it deserves a special welcome as the first of a new series of Classical Studies (in which four other titles are already announced), to be published under the direction of the Professors of Classics in Kiel.

J. A. DAVISON.

University of Manchester.

HOMER IN A NEW METRE.

S. O. ANDREW: *The Wrath of Achilles*. Pp. viii + 226. London: Dent, 1938. Cloth, 6s.

This translation is a very interesting experiment, for the author has invented an entirely original metre. This metre and his reasons for adopting it are explained in a note at the end, from which we quote the following: 'The metre, which is accentual, has five stresses to the line, separated from each other by one or two unstressed syllables, e.g.:

Of he turned on his side and often he lay.

This is the line in its simplest form: usually there are unstressed words, which are hypermetric, at the beginning or end, or both; one or two at the beginning, one only at the end, e.g.:

That his wife and mother and child upon him
might look,
Mourning the might and the manhood of noble
Patroclus.
But the blessed Gods beholding had pity on
Hector.

This quotation will give some notion of the metre, but it admits of other varia-

tions, which it would take long to explain. In practice it has several virtues. It is light and rapid and free from stiffness and pomposity, and Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch tells us in the preface that he has found that it holds his attention at long stretch better than any previous version. These are real merits; but every version sacrifices something, and the metre here chosen has disadvantages. The line is shorter and lighter than Homer's, and as translation inevitably tends to give line for line, this sometimes means cutting Homer to the bare bone, with a loss of richness and sonority. There are few memorable lines. Moreover the metre is somewhat indeterminate. As a rule the movement is felt as trochaic or dactylic, but the admission of an anacrusis sometimes suggests anapaests, as the writer himself admits. The result is that though the lines run easily and have rhythm, the reader has no clear norm in his head. This impairs the poet's resource of varying the rhythm with the sense; for unless the norm is clear, the variation cannot be appre-

ciated. The diction of this version is usually simple and plain, and holds the mean successfully between the artificially poetic and jarring colloquialisms, but the author often allows himself awkward inversions of order, e.g. in the line

Then Hector the blameless son of Peleus
addressed.

The books translated are *Iliad* I, XI, XVI-XXIV, and reading through them

exposes the weakness of the once fashionable theory of the 'Wrath' as the nucleus of the *Iliad*. The later books, with the others left out, are somehow in the air and lose point and interest. However, we gather that the writer hopes later to give us the missing books, and we hope that he will, for this version deserves to be completed.

F. R. EARP.

THE HIPPOLYTUS.

Michael TIERNEY: *The Hippolytus* of Euripides. (From the Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, Vol. XLIV, Section C, No. 2.) Pp. 16. Dublin: Hodges and Figgis, 1937. Paper, 1s.

THIS paper discusses the literary, legendary and religious background of the *Hippolytus*, with a general criticism. The main thesis is that Hippolytus is drawn as an Orphic type, professing a mystical doctrine of φύσις and a paradoxical σωφροσύνη. An interesting paper, but disfigured, like many such enquiries, by wild irrelevancies. Every fact or hypothesis connected with the subject-matter of the play seems to be regarded as 'background', but much of it, as far as the play goes, is underground. What is the point of remarking, as if it were relevant, that 'the hanging-goddess motif . . . belongs to this type of cult from the beginning'? Is this why Phaedra hangs herself? If so, was Hermione in the *Andromache* prevented from hanging because she is not and never was a hanging-goddess? Three wishes were traditional; in making Theseus use only one Euripides 'shows that he is making free with ancient material'. Is the *Hippolytus* a play, or an emanation from folk-lore? Reasoning appropriate to history but not to art leads to the surprising suggestion that the character of Hippolytus is in part based on that of Socrates.

Such excesses come from errors of method, not of judgement only. It is plausible that we should understand the plays better if we were less ignorant of their 'background'; e.g. 'Nowhere

do we possess anything like a complete set of the documents which make up the literary antecedents of a play'. But what if we did? We cannot understand the Peace of Nicias without knowing its political antecedents; but a play, like a statue, being a work of art, is in all essentials self-contained and self-explanatory. If we cannot understand it, it is our fault, or the poet's. The *Hippolytus*, being a work of art, proceeded complete from Euripides' mind. There it is. What had previously gone into Euripides' mind, whether from literary antecedents, legend, or any other source ('background'), we may guess at if we like —most safely from the play itself. If we guess correctly, we may see what went on in Euripides' mind; the more literary antecedents we have, the more likely we are to guess correctly; what comes out of that mind still has to explain itself.¹ The *Hippolytus* does; and when Professor Tierney points out (convincingly, I think) that Hippolytus is drawn as an Orphic, he does not explain Hippolytus to me. Him and his tragedy I knew already (as I think); both remain the same; what I have learned is a good deal about Orphism.

¹ For example, a piece of 'background' to the Eroica Symphony is that Beethoven first dedicated it to Napoleon, then changed his mind about Napoleon and dedicated it to Prince Lichnovsky. What has this to do with the music? Absolutely nothing. A classical case of muddle between external background and criticism of the absolute work of art is Mark Pattison on *Samson Agonistes*. He might actually have criticized better with less information.

If a play is one of a connected trilogy, ignorance of the rest is of course a bar. Also we might fail to understand a play through general ignorance of the times; only 'background' does not mean this here, and in any case such background will not explain a play, but only enable it to explain itself. The poet however may be assuming in the audience some knowledge lost to us; this really is missing background—something which the play itself is using. A good example is Hippolytus' reference to his *μιαφύων προγεννητόρων* (vv. 1379 ff.), which Professor Tierney explains, and I think rightly, as a reference to the Orphic doctrine of sin inherited from the

Titans.¹ But why is it there? Euripides was no pedant; he was primarily interested in his Hippolytus, not in Orphism, and must be using the point for the sake of Hippolytus. Clearly Hippolytus' doctrinaire and incorrect explanation of his fall accentuates his tragic unconsciousness of the truth. Real background enables the play to explain itself more fully; the Troezen cult, Sophocles' *Phaëdra*, even the first *Hippolytus*, do not. These only help us to guess.

H. D. F. KITTO.

University of Glasgow.

¹ With a reference to Rose on the *παλαῖον πένθος*, *Greek Poetry and Life*, p. 79 ff.

GREEK PROSE RHYTHM.

Stanislaw SKIMINA: *État actuel des études sur le rythme de la prose grecque*.

I. Pp. iv+213. Cracow: Imprimerie de l'Université, 1937. Paper.

In this 'Part I' of his *État actuel* M. Skimina deals with metrical prose; 'Part II', on accentual prose, was published in 1930. In this volume he arranges his material differently. He takes his Greek authors chronologically (more than forty of them, from Herodotus to S. John Chrysostom); he reviews modern theories on each author, quoting any useful statistics; then summarizes the results acquired. The space given to each author varies with the amount of published work available; thus Isocrates has 19 pages, Plato 16, Demosthenes 30; Philo and Pausanias have only a page each, Isaeus and Aeschines only a paragraph.

As far as possible, M. Skimina allows other scholars to speak for themselves, and only interposes criticism when their method is seriously misleading. His summaries may seem a little timid to readers hoping for clear-cut results, but I think that at the present stage of rhythmical studies his discretion is to be praised; and he himself shows the way to more fruitful research both by his passing comments and by the statement of method which prefaces his own work on Hyperides. Before considering the questions raised here, I note three points concerning post-classical

authors. (1) The Hellenistic period is treated at length, and I had no idea that so much work had been done on it. (2) M. Skimina is satisfied that the writer of *Hebrews* consciously used metrical clausulae, but is sceptical of results for S. Paul and S. James. (3) To the lists of clausulae sought by the novelists I can add for Xenophon of Ephesus: ---οῦ, -οῦ---οῦ, οοοῦ, -οο-οῦ, οοο-οῦ.

I turn to questions of method. M. Skimina justly observes that the different methods of different scholars make a synthesis of results impossible at present, and he pleads for unified and accepted principles of research; I whole-heartedly agree. The important thing is that each scholar should work and 'show his working' in such a way that anyone else can use his material in spite of differences of theory. This means, first, that there should be an agreed scansion of doubtful syllables; secondly, that all cadences should be recorded separately, even if it is believed that some of them are variants of the same form. M. Skimina's ingenious tables for Hyperides fulfil these conditions admirably. If you merely want the percentage of -οῦ---οῦ in the clausula, you add the figures for -οῦ---οῦ and -οῦ---; if you think οοο---οῦ and -οοο-οῦ are variants of the same form, there are figures for them too, again with the final syllable distin-

guished. If you wish, you can compare these *clausules de périodes* with the *clausules de membres* in another table; or again with the rhythms of other authors or of unmetrical prose scanned in the same way.

Remembering Wenig and Heibges, who class ----○○○○ as a double cretic, one feels the more grateful to M. Skimina for so sane and useful a book.

W. H. SHEWRING.

Ampleforth College, York.

SOPHISTES AND POLITIKOS.

E. M. MANASSE: *Platons Sophistes und Politikos: Das Problem der Wahrheit*. Pp. 231. Berlin-Schöneberg: printed by S. Scholem, 1937. Paper.

THE argument of this book is somewhat obscure, and I cannot be sure that I have grasped Dr. Manasse's main intention correctly. I will confine myself here to a statement of what I take to be his central theme.

'Truth' to Plato, and perhaps to philosophers generally, has a double significance, ontological and logical; i.e. it may mean metaphysical reality, opposed to nothingness, or it may mean truth as a property of judgments, where its opposite is falsehood. The Greek terms *ὄν* and *μὴ ὄν* stand for both these senses, and this is illustrated by Plato's argument in the *Sophist*. The climax to that dialogue is the account of Dialectic, as the science which maps out the varieties of Being, and shows how some can, and others cannot, blend with each other. And from this point of view Plato solves the problem of false judgment; for all judgment asserts a connexion between terms, and we may either combine terms which are really incapable of *κοινωνία*, i.e. judge falsely, or faithfully copy the nature of things, and so judge truly. Dr. Manasse remarks that there is some difficulty here (p. 38): for whilst it is easy to see how two classes can be combined—for instance, Sameness with Being—it is less easy to see how a judgment, *λόγος*, being an act of the mind, can be 'combined' with Being and Not-Being. Either the notion of *μὴ ὄν* or that of *κοινωνεῖν* seems to be used in a double sense.

The notion of truth is also, in a less direct way, the subject of the *Statesman*; for its argument turns on the distinction between the *true* statesman and his rivals or *imitators*. This brings

home to us the close connexion between the *Sophist* and *Statesman*; it was the fact that the sophist belonged to the genus of imitators which prompted the whole metaphysical digression in the former of these two Dialogues. Dr. Manasse points out a difference (which, however, seems to be a verbal one) between their attitudes to Imitation: whereas in the *Sophist* it is a *τέχνη*, in the *Statesman* it is the pretence to have *τέχνη* by someone who has not got it.

I agree with what seems to be the main result of this part of the book, i.e. that when Plato speaks of Truth and Imitation, it is not always clear whether he is considering the psychological attitudes or the metaphysical status of their objects.

An important stylistic question is raised by the same two dialogues: does the new leader of the discussion, the Eleatic Stranger, inherit the full degree of authority which had formerly belonged to Socrates? Dr. Manasse constantly has this question in mind, and his answer seems to be much the same as that of Stenzel, who held that even after this important outward revolution Plato still does not identify himself wholly with the leading speaker. But Stenzel and Manasse differ considerably in their estimate of the *Theaetetus*, and its relation to the *Sophist* and *Statesman*. Stenzel's theory is that the *Sophist* is the positive reply to the negations and doubts of the *Theaetetus*; he thinks that it is the function of Socrates to state the problems which the Stranger will have to solve. In this case, Plato is deliberately holding something in reserve in the *Theaetetus*, and reviving the form, but not the spirit, of his earliest dialogues. Dr. Manasse, in an appendix on the *Theaetetus*, takes up the position that the connexion between this dialogue and the two later mem-

bers of the trilogy is merely an outward one. He has the stylistic evidence on his side; but he goes on to maintain that the problems of the *Theaetetus* are not those which find their answer in the *Sophist*, and that it is, in fact, a sincerely aporetic dialogue of the earlier type. He then deals with the *Sophist* and *Statesman*, and shows by analysis of the argument that there is an intimate structural connexion between them. I find myself asking what exactly this is intended to prove; it is, of course, an undisputed fact that the second and third dialogues of the group are interrelated, but surely this does not help us a step in deciding whether the first is

connected with the second; and such evidence as Dr. Manasse brings to show that the *Theaetetus* is concerned with Plato's earlier problems is not particularly convincing.

Plato's theory of Knowledge in the central books of the *Republic* is the subject of another appendix. May an English reviewer drop a modest hint to foreign writers that we have a considerable literature dealing accurately with this subject, of which they will find some account in Mr. Hardie's *Study in Plato*, and that a survey of it is in all respects *lohnend*?

D. J. ALLAN.

Balliol College, Oxford.

ITALIAN COMMENTARIES ON POLYBIUS.

Polibio: Il libro secondo delle Storie. Introduzione e commento storico di P. TREVES. Pp. 302. Naples: Rondinella Alfredo, 1937. Paper. L. 10.

Polibio: Pagine scelte, con introduzione e note a cura di B. LAVAGNINI. Seconda edizione. Pp. xx+87. Turin: Gambino, 1938. Paper. L. 8.50.

CONVINCED of the essential unity of Polybius' historical thought and method, Treves has preferred to try the experiment of issuing a school edition of a single book of Polybius rather than to edit a collection of select passages: 'soprattutto perche un' antologia polibiana spezza, necessariamente, il divenire dell' opera' (p. 14). In many ways the choice of the second book is a good one. Though with Book I it forms only an introduction to Polybius' main theme, yet it illustrates most of the merits and demerits of his work together with the many-sidedness of his achievement; his interest in military history is exemplified in the accounts of the battles of Telamon and Sellasia, while his geographical insight is shown by the description of Cisalpine Gaul; Polybius the politician and champion of the Achaean League is revealed in his defence of Aratus, while his critical methods and historical ideals are shown by his attack on Phylarchus, the partisan historian of Cleomenes' reign. Further, the book is varied in content,

but has, as Treves emphasizes, a tripartite unity in the Illyrian, Gallic and Cleomenic wars, stories which flow together like three streams to feed the great river of the common history of Rome and the Mediterranean world. Whether this diversity of narrative (which also includes events in Spain) may tend to stimulate the interest of the young reader or to confuse him, can only be tested by experience in the class-room. Book I presents a much more straightforward narrative, but if the pupil gains a deeper insight into the essential unity of ancient history, Treves is to be congratulated on having essayed the more difficult task. In this connexion it may be noted that the introduction, which deals well but exclusively with Polybius, gives little aid. The historical commentary is confined to page-to-page notes; would not a brief explanatory outline of events have proved helpful?

The commentary is full and, as might be expected, good. Treves' work on the period in the Italian journals and the *Enciclopedia italiana* is well known, and to it the reader will turn who wishes for further exposition of his views on controversial matters. It would be out of place to refer here to any of the problems of the period: suffice it to say that Treves has given copious and up-to-date references to the modern literature, German, French and English

as well as Italian. This service in fact may be appreciated rather by more advanced readers, since the student who has to be told that *διασαφίσαι* is the 'aor. sigmatic att. di δια-σαφέω' will perhaps not worry his head very much about a reference, given later in the same note, to an article by E. Bickermann in *Gnomon*, VIII. From this it may be gathered that the linguistic notes are primarily designed for those with but little Greek. The text is that of Büttner-Wobst (Teubner, 1905). As to production: I have noted a certain number of misprints; pages 177-188 have been bound up in the wrong order; and as my copy, though carefully handled, has begun to disintegrate, one wonders how the book will respond to class-room use. It is only fair to add however that the price is low. But to return to the main issue, it may be said that Treves has produced a clear and useful edition to which historians will turn to seek his views on given points, and which by introducing for the first time young Italian students to a complete book of

Polybius should render a valuable service to the cause of education.

The way for this work had already been prepared by Lavagnini's *Pagine scelte*. In the preface of the first edition (1936) we read that 'per la prima volta nei secoli tocca a Polibio il raro onore di venir letto nelle scuole'; may we deduce from the quick appearance of a second edition that honour, like mercy, 'is twice bless'd; it blesseth him that gives and him that takes'? A straightforward account of Polybius is followed by selected passages which illustrate the plan of his work, his idea of history, the Roman constitution and customs, the growth of the empire, and incidents such as the flight of Demetrius from Rome. The notes are more simple than in Treves' edition and should prove adequate, especially when supplemented by a Latin translation which has been published separately (Palermo: Trimarchi) 'per facilitare ai giovani dei nostri Licei l'intelligenza lessicale e sintattica della lingua polibiana'.

HOWARD H. SCULLARD.

King's College, London.

A LATIN VERSION OF DEMETRIUS ΠΕΡΙ 'ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑΣ.

Bernice Virginia WALL: *A Medieval Latin Version of Demetrius' De Elocutione*. Pp. ix + 125; facsimile of MS. (The Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin, Vol. V.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1937. Paper, \$2.

THIS is an edition of part of an early-fourteenth-century Latin MS in the University of Illinois, containing translations of excerpts from Aristotelian and Pseudo-Aristotelian works. Among them appears a treatise *De Elocutione*, which proves to be an abbreviated version of the Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας traditionally ascribed to Demetrius Phalereus, but which the translator or scribe, misled by its Peripatetic colouring, evidently regarded as Aristotelian.

Miss Wall's work is likely to prove of considerable use. Her introduction contains a detailed analysis of the style and method of the anonymous translator, and deals at length with questions

of orthography, punctuation, and corrections; the text itself has been accurately collated, and there is a useful running commentary which exhibits points of divergence from the Greek; the whole is rounded off by a commendably complete index. What is lacking is some attempt to do more than present the results of this very painstaking analysis in statistical form—though it is perhaps unfair to blame Miss Wall for failing to do more than she set out to do. At the same time, a document such as this is of less value for the correction of the text of the Greek than for the evidence which it affords of the purpose and methods of mediaeval translators; in fact, it is only after these questions have been closely investigated that it is possible with any confidence to maintain that departures in the Latin from the received text reflect a corresponding divergence in the MS tradition. It would have been useful at least to attempt to elicit the

principles upon which the translator of the *De Elocutione* abbreviated his original. In what aspects of the literary criticism of Demetrius was he primarily interested? Did he make his selections intelligently, or not?

Clearly, the translation as we have it is inspired by the immense revival of interest in Aristotelian studies in the thirteenth century, due in no small part to the energy of William of Moerbeke. The work of Grabmann and Dittmeyer has already done something to show

that that interest was by no means confined to the logical and metaphysical treatises, in spite of Albertus Magnus and St. Thomas; and it is to be hoped that the forthcoming publication of the selections from the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* which immediately precede the *De Elocutione* in the Illinois MS will provide the material for a still more fruitful investigation of the humanistic activity of the period.

K. J. MAIDMENT.

Jesus College, Oxford.

A HANDBOOK OF LATIN LITERATURE.

H. J. ROSE: *A Handbook of Latin Literature from the earliest times to the death of St. Augustine*. Pp. ix+557.

London: Methuen, 1936. Cloth, 21s.

PROFESSOR ROSE has put students of Latin literature under a very real obligation by the publication of this handbook. It contains in the compass of little over five hundred pages a great deal of information which it would not be very easy to find elsewhere, at least so succinctly and, at times, so pithily expressed. But students must not look to it for more than it professes to supply. It is not a history of Latin literature: it is a handbook in which they may find all, or nearly all, of the relevant facts, the lives of the authors, the titles of their works with, so far as they are known, the dates of their publication, short abstracts of the contents, and discussions of a large number of questions raised by the critics. They will find also, in two introductory chapters, a very clear and readable account of the background and beginnings of Latin literature, of what is known and of much that has been conjectured of the intellectual and cultural life of the Romans before contact with the Greeks stirred in them the ambition to create a literature of their own; and the tale of the writers is carried on from Ennius to Claudian, with a very useful chapter on 'Philosophy, Science, and Scholarship'. The author has, moreover, included in his final chapter some account of the principal Christian writers of the Latin world during the first five centuries of our era.

But the plan of the work excludes

what is properly called the history of literature—that is to say, the discussion of the continuous development of the various literary forms in their proper historical and social setting. This lack is only partially made good by the introductions to the various chapters and by incidental remarks, valuable though they often are, scattered here and there in the text and the very full and erudite notes. The student will have to piece out for himself the development (say) of the Epic as a distinct literary genre, of tragedy, of satire, of history. He will miss any consecutive account of the development of satire, that characteristic product of Roman genius, from Ennius to Juvenal. He will not find anything more than scattered hints to enable him to form any clear conception of the way, for instance, in which the rough and vigorous workmanship of Ennius is transformed step by step into the delicate and intricate cadences and structure of the *Aeneid*. This is precluded in large part by the limits within which the book is confined. It may seem invidious, where so much has been given, to complain that so much has been withheld: but the reviewer must express his regret that it was not found possible to exclude some of the learned abundance about writers who were never of much literary importance and are now no more than names, and to include a more fundamental treatment of really important figures who are landmarks in the history of Latin literature. As it is, many of the introductions to the various chapters show us

how capably and vigorously that might have been done.

Some special points of detail must be noticed. On p. 4 the Arval brothers are said to have been still in existence in A.D. 218 under Elagabalus: they were in existence at least till 240 A.D. under the third Gordian, as is proved by the inscription discovered at Rome in 1914, published in Dessau, no. 9522. On p. 5 the author speaks of Cato as referring to the custom of boys singing heroic ballads at Roman banquets: Cato speaks of guests doing so; the statement that they were boys comes, *teste Nonio*, from Varro. The discussion of the work of Lucilius (pp. 82 ff.) should have taken some account of the *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius* of C. Cichorius, an indispensable supplement to Marx, who alone is mentioned. The pages on the Roman orators (105 ff.) do not take sufficient account of Cicero's indebtedness to the work of Isocrates and later Greek rhetoricians in the theories he expounds in the *de Oratore*, for which reference may now be made to the important work of H. K. Schulte, *Orator* (Frankfurt, 1935). On p. 127, while passing reference is made to the problem of misplaced lines in Lucretius, no notice whatever is taken of the much more important and closely related

problem of the order in which the books of the *De Rerum Natura* were originally composed: and the discussion of the 'Hymn to Venus' in the proem of the first book is quite perfunctory. The discussion of Catullus (pp. 139 ff.) is rather disappointing, not enough being said of the consummate art with which even his apparently most artless pieces are composed. In discussing (p. 262, n. 99) the *Catalepton* the author commits himself to the interpretation 'in small parcels': it is at least very doubtful whether this is correct; the explanation of E. Reitzenstein that *λεπτός* (*macer*) refers not to size but to style has much to be said for it. The statement on p. 294 that the elegy on Cornelia is perhaps the finest poem that Propertius ever wrote is one that, though often made by others, will not stand the test. On p. 297 reference should have been made to the possibility, mooted by Cichorius in 1922 in *Römische Studien*, that Livy had taught rhetoric before turning to the writing of history, and it is very unfortunate that the date of his death should be given as 17 B.C. On pp. 401 and 411 Domitius Afer is most inexplicably identified with the Marcus Aper of Tacitus' *Dialogus*.

R. M. HENRY.

Queen's University, Belfast.

A DUTCH HANDBOOK OF LATIN LITERATURE.

P. J. ENK: *Handboek der Latijnse Letterkunde van de oudste tijden tot het optreden van Cicero*. Tweede Deel: Het tijdvak van letterkundige ontwikkeling onder invloed van het Hellenisme: 1. De dichters Livius Andronicus, Naevius en Plautus. Two vols. Pp. 338, 342. Zutphen: Thieme, 1937. Paper, f. 12 and 15.

In this the second part of his Handbook Dr. Enk begins a systematic review of pre-Ciceronian literature. His plan, as the preface informs us, is now restricted to this early period. The curtailment is regrettable, but clearly the work, if continued on this scale even to the end of the Golden Age, would cease to be a Handbook and become a Library.

An introductory essay on 'Hellenism

at Rome' provides a sensible and suggestive analysis of Greek influences, even if it tends to underestimate their importance. Dr. Enk is an enthusiastic Latinist, and stoutly rebuts all unfair criticism of the Roman genius. At times his enthusiasm is rather easily aroused: thus he says of the first line of Livius's *Odyssey* (i. 29), 'One can see that Andronicus is impressing upon his poem from the very beginning an Italian stamp; he intends to provide not a translation but an adaptation.' This judgment depends upon the use of *Camena*, a happy but surely obvious choice, and *insece*, which I believe (*pace* Leo) to be suggested by good etymology rather than good taste. In general the section on Livius, where the material is scanty, seems a trifle forced.

In discussing Naevius Dr. Enk is more in his element; he sets out the facts clearly and gives a fair presentation of the arguments for and against each debatable point before stating his own view, which is generally unassailable. A good example of his method is to be seen where he discusses (i. 75-78) whether the lines

blande et docte percontat Aenea quo pacto
Troiam urbem liquerit

refer to Dido or not. Most people will be pleased that Dr. Enk votes for Dido.

The main interest, however, centres upon his treatment of Plautus, who occupies 591 pages out of 680. After a short biographical section (in which he upholds—rightly, I think—the form Maccus as against Maccius), a general survey of Plautus's literary remains, and a brief review of the prologues, Dr. Enk takes each play in turn, and describes the plot with the aid of translated passages, sometimes of considerable length. He then discusses what is known or conjectured about the Greek original, and considers the extent to which it has been modified by Plautus. There follows (usually) a criticism of the play, a note on the date of production, and finally a bibliography. Thus Dr. Enk supplies in an orderly form all the data available to the critic; he does not so much offer his personal judgments upon the plays and their author. The critical estimates of the *Miles Gloriosus*, *Mostellaria* and *Persa* are full and good, but most of the other plays are dismissed with surprising brevity, or else receive rather uneven treatment. Thus the *Captivi*, remarkable play as it is, has no such special section assigned to it; criticism appears incidentally in the section dealing with the method of adaptation. Again, in the *Aulularia* the characterization of Euclio is examined at great length, but Megadorus, Eunomia and Lyconides,

who are all well drawn, receive only a passing notice (ii. 281).

After the plays have been considered singly, however, Dr. Enk returns to the general question of Plautus's methods as an adapter, and shows with admirable force and clarity how great and original his genius was. It is refreshing to find the ill-founded criticisms of Jachmann and Norwood so thoroughly refuted; to find, indeed, that Plautus is being estimated as a playwright for the Roman comic stage, and not as a pedantically exact and consistent essayist. Yet even Dr. Enk at times forgets the comic atmosphere: so (ii. 163, 276) he objects to the invitation of Labrax to dinner by Daemones (*Rudens* 1417) as a serious flaw. Really it is a happy touch, in the very spirit of light-hearted comedy; moreover it leads up to the final Puckish shattering of dramatic convention which makes the 'curtain' so effective. In general, however, Dr. Enk is a penetrating critic, and gives Plautus his full due both as a playwright and as a metrist.

For many readers the most valuable feature of the book will be the bibliographical information, which is remarkably full and accurate. The only important omission which I have observed is Rogers's translation of the *Menaechmi*.

A few errata have escaped notice: i. 154, l. 16 the name of the speaker, Demaenetus, has fallen out; ib. 217, l. 6 for 'est ist' read 'es ist'; ib. 255 *Casina* 18 for *tempestata* read *tempestate*; ii. 43, l. 5 for 'truck' read 'trick'; ib. 240, l. 14 the quotation comes from the *Mercator*. The corrections are worth making, since the handbook deserves to hold its position for some time as the best and most detailed treatment of this early period.

HUGH TREDENNICK.

Queen Mary College,
University of London.

THREE ROMAN POETS.

Three Roman Poets. Plautus, Catullus, Ovid. Their Lives, Times and Works. By F. A. WRIGHT. Pp. xi + 268. London: Routledge, 1938. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

NO. CCCLXXV. VOL. LII.

In his preface Mr. Wright anticipates the question 'why these three?' He finds the trio of his choice connected by the fact that 'they write firstly to please themselves, and then to please

their readers', and he thinks that there is more to be said about them as men than about Lucretius, Virgil, and Horace, who led 'a sheltered existence'. (Until Horace reached the age at which Catullus died, his life was not very sheltered, and who can say how Lucretius lived?—the times he lived in did not make for comfort. But let that pass.) His account of the times in which his poets wrote is clear, vigorous, and readable, and his analysis of their works effectively brings out their chief qualities and their relation to their environment. The scholarly reader will find little that is new in the book, but the amateur will get a good deal of information, conveyed in a pleasant style; for Mr. Wright has avoided all suspicion of pedantry. Indeed, he seems now and then to have gone to the opposite extreme in setting down as facts what are only conjectures, more or less plausible. Sometimes he takes a risk to give colour and coherence to his narrative. It may be that Plautus was 'Titus, son of Titus' (p. 9), and that the Cinna who brought Parthenius to Rome was the father of the poet (p. 151); it may even be that Catullus's first volume was 'issued by the publishing house of Atticus' (p. 114), though we have not a particle of evidence in the matter. But it is improbable that Metellus Celer was accompanied to his province by his wife (p. 102); it is improbable that Philematium in the *Mostellaria* appeared on the stage in a 'bath-towel' and changed into a 'silk tunic' handed to her by Scapha. The writer of a popular work has a duty not to put wrong ideas into the heads of his readers. And there are times when Mr. Wright goes not beyond the facts, but against them. After drawing attention to the appearance of rhyme in

Plautus, he goes on (p. 29) 'he had no immediate successors: for neither Ennius nor Terence show' (this laxity of syntax reappears on p. 43) 'any trace of rhyme'; then who wrote the lines which are cited in every discussion of Latin rhyme, *haec omnia vidi inflammari*, etc.? Again, in discussing the variety of Plautine lyrics, he contrasts Terence, who (p. 38) 'keeps strictly to iambic and trochaic lines and never ventures upon even the semblance of a song'; what about the cretics and bacchiacs of the *Andria*? Is it true that 'Horace in his first Satires had used the lash pretty freely on Maecenas' (p. 212)? Or that Catullus makes 'one striking mistake' in the *Coma* by substituting 'a divine ostrich' for a wind (p. 152)? These are hasty statements, and there are other marks of haste: Casina is not 'the girl from Casinum' (p. 59), and Corinna is not 'a hybrid form from the Greek *Korê*' (p. 181).

Mr. Wright has freely illustrated his remarks by his own translations into English verse. In dealing with Plautus and Catullus he often falls into artificialities which are false to the simple idiom of the originals, and he is no stickler for accuracy. Poem L of Catullus is transmuted into

Licinius mine, all yesterday
We passed in poets' joyful play
Among such metres as may use
Fastidious courtiers of the Muse;
For poesy can make a man
More drunk than thy Falernian,

where *delicatos* is mistranslated and the last couplet is pure invention. But he can do better, and his rendering of Leaeana's song in the *Curculio* in the manner of a pantomime ditty is a happy *tour de force*.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

TIBULLIANA.

- (1) *Albii Tibulli aliorumque Carminum Libri Tres*. Iterum edidit Fridericus Waltharius LENZ. Pp. xxxii + 115. Leipzig: Teubner, 1937. M. 3.60.
- (2) *Tibullo*. Di Nino SALANITRO. Pp. 193. Naples: Loffredo, 1938. L. 32.
- (3) *Tibullo: Elegie con Introduzione e Commento*. Di Emanuele CESAREO. Pp. xx + 98. Florence: Le Monnier, 1938. L. 8.

SINCE Dr. Lenz produced his first edition of Tibullus the most important

contribution to the recension has been Ullman's work on the mediaeval Florilegia. Ullman's results have been incorporated in the revised introduction and in the apparatus. There is, furthermore, a useful *Conspectus Versuum qui in Florilegiis et Excerptis leguntur*. These additions, with some changes in the text of the poems, are the most noticeable features of this second edition.

In the first edition the editor has expressed his belief that it was unlikely that better MSS. than those already known would ever be discovered. Ullman's poor opinion of the textual value of the Florilegia has intensified his despair. In 1829 Lachmann spoke in much the same way as Dr. Lenz, and Dr. Lenz referred to that fact. Yet since Lachmann's time the three MSS. which are most esteemed to-day have been brought to light, and even since this second edition has appeared the missing folios of the St. Victor Florilegium which contained Tibullan excerpts have been found in the Vatican. They are not very helpful, but better material may still be hidden.

Dr. Lenz is conservative. All his faith is in MSS. He would, it is clear, subscribe to K. F. Smith's view that 'an ounce of manuscript, even if that manuscript is no better than the *Ambrosianus*, is worth a hundredweight of conjecture.' Of course, it depends on the conjecture. No editor, however conservative, would think of rejecting conjectures like *Tarbella* and *alat* (1. 7. 9, 16). The present text does not seem to respect any conjecture which is less than a hundred years old, and clings very closely to MSS. These are admitted to be untrustworthy. A *V Ber.* are but the best of a bad lot, late and interpolated; the Florilegia, with the possible exception of *Exc. Frisingensia*, are treacherous guides; F, which threw a little light on the cheerless prospect, was but a fragment, now lost, and the only record which exists of its readings is imperfect. The *deteriores* also are MSS, and, as such, particularly the Lachmann favourites, receive consideration from Dr. Lenz. On the whole, he is to be applauded for not confining his regard to A *V Ber.* The situation seems to call for eclectic procedure. The

Florilegia, for example, seem preferable in 1. 1. 48 (*imbre*) and 9. 23 (*spes*), where Calonghi adheres to the complete MSS. But in 1. 4. 55 there does not seem to be sufficient reason to reject *offeret* (A *V Ber.*) in favour of *offeret* (*dett.*). In 1. 3. 4 the editor wisely relinquishes *mors precor atra* (y d g). In several passages he expresses misgivings. Most readers will agree with his 'rectum fortasse adhuc latet' on 1. 4. 44 *uenturam amiciat imbrifer arcus aquam*. This reading, by the way, pleased Scaliger (*Castig.* p. 121: '*uenturam amiciat. Quod rectissimum est . . . sed duplici ij scribendum, am-jiciat*'), and more than one modern scholar believes that this is what Tibullus wrote! Dr. Lenz has doubts also about 3. 12. 19 *sis inueni grata; ueniet etc.*, though he seems satisfied regarding 1. 7. 61 *te canit agricola magna cum uenerit urbe* and 5. 33 *et tantum uenerata uirum hunc sedula curet*. In 1. 9. 25 *lene* is retained, with the footnote: '*subaudi merum ex 26 mero.*' In 3. 5. 11 he sides with Cartault and Calonghi in reading *sacrilegi templis amouimus aegros*, but cites no parallel to the peculiar practice. It is hard to believe that Lygdamus wrote 3. 4. 25 f. as recorded in our manuscripts, and the difficulty of 1. 2. 7 is not removed by the punctuation: *ianua difficilis, domini te uerberet imber*. Four passages are obelized; it would have been well to have increased this number.

Some conjectures which deserve mention have been ignored, like Heyne's *iurata* (1. 6. 7), *pronas fluminis* (1. 9. 36), *Valgi* (1. 10. 11), Guyet's *deum* (1. 1. 35), Housman's *non sine re* (1. 7. 9), Palmer's *uirum se sedula* (1. 5. 33); indeed, the last suggestion might well be placed in the text. Dr. Lenz has been criticized for introducing exegetical matter into his apparatus. In principle, I think that he is justified; exegesis is sometimes necessary to defend a particular reading. But some of the matter which he introduces does seem out of place. Why, for instance, are we referred on *bipenne* (1. 6. 47) to W. Baehrens' commentary on the *App. Probi*? No question of orthography arises, and the history of the emergence of the substantive in Virgil and Tibullus seems irrelevant. On 1. 7. 61 (see above)

there are six references in connexion with the prosody; it would have simplified matters to have cited Housman's masterly article in *C.Q.*, 1921, 1 ff., and his note on Manilius 4. 469 should have been mentioned with regard to the genitive of *Semele* (3. 4. 45); the treatise to which we are referred is not above reproach (see *J. Ph.*, xxxi 240 ff.).

The information regarding the readings of MSS. is generous in amount and accurate. Would it not be well to include in the *Conspectus* all MSS. which are cited in the apparatus? It is embarrassing to encounter the ghosts of dead editions, like '*Thuaneus Guyeti*', '*Sfortianus Statii*', etc. And why a reference like '*Anglicanus apud Huschkium*'? It should be '*apud Heinsium*', if its source had to be given. It would have been well to check these citations; a glance at Heinsius's notes would determine the source of *lota* in 3. 12. 3.

There are very few misprints. *Paris*. 7909 (for 7989) should be corrected on p. xxvi. This slip appeared in the first edition.

The editor has clearly put a lot of hard work into this book. It is a book which will be appreciated by scholars; but no one is more aware than Dr. Lenz that the text it presents is far from ideal. Bricks could not be made without straw.

Mr. Salanitro has felt that Italy has not taken her share in the literary criticism of Tibullus; so he has combined what he has already published with fresh matter and produced the present book. It may be admitted at once that he has done much to repair the national defect. His chapters are interesting and stimulating, marked by scholarship, judgement and taste.

He deals with a number of problems in connexion with the life and poems of his hero. He has read a vast amount of pertinent literature and discusses the views of his predecessors, sometimes at great length. His own conclusions are put forward cogently and modestly '*senza pretese di assoluta originalità o di verità infallibile*.' As regards the biography of Tibullus he is orthodox; he refuses to accept the theories of Harrington, Baehrens and others. He agrees with Gruppe in identifying Lyg-

damus with Ovid. He finds an allusion to the *Lygdamus-Ovidiana* in *Trist.* 4. 10. 19 f. 'at mihi iam puero caelestia sacra placebant, inque suum furtime Musa trahebat opus.' He argues that Tibullus himself published Book I in 26/25 B.C.: and probably published Book II also, about 24/23. Ovid and Sulpicia, with the approval of Messalla, published the *Corpus* after the death of the poet. He finds it difficult, if not impossible, to determine the authorship of the *Panegyricus*, but he rejects the more or less fantastic suggestions of Crusius and others. It should be regarded as the serious effort of a young man to bring himself forward; in spite of turgidity and tedious erudition, it breathes genuine affection and loyalty. III 9 and 11 are assigned to Sulpicia. Tibullus was the author of 19 and 20, but the *nota domina* cannot be identified with either Delia or Nemesis. Mr. Salanitro contends that she was Sulpicia, who succeeded Delia and Nemesis in the poet's heart. Tibullus's silence with regard to Augustus was not due to positive hostility, but to indifference. He had no sympathy for the republican opposition, nor was he much affected by national sentiment. Such references as he makes to the great achievements of Rome arise from his desire to honour Messalla. He is primarily the poet of love and of the country. It is a grave mistake to think that his poems are imitated from Greek exemplars. 'It is highly deplorable to represent Latin poets generally, and elegiac poets in particular, as mere refashioners, imitators and translators of their Greek masters.' Tibullus's themes are derived from personal experience. Mr. Salanitro holds that the Delia poems are arranged in the order of their composition. I 4 (belonging to the Marathus group) is out of place, and should possibly be re-united with 8 and 9; Tibullus may have himself altered the original order so as to give prominence to Marathus. Mr. Salanitro is inclined to follow Némethy and place II 3 after II 6; 'it is clearly the last poem of the Nemesis cycle.' A considerable space is devoted to an attempt to discover something of the history of Delia and Nemesis, especially of the former. We

are not justified in inferring from I 6. 67 f. that Delia was a *libertina*. She was apparently a married woman, though Tibullus was not at first aware of this fact. Her husband was absent from Rome when the second elegy was written; later on, he disappears altogether and Delia becomes a courtesan. There are a number of interesting notes on textual and exegetical difficulties. The final pages contain an appreciation of the poet's quality and style: 'Sincerity is the dominant note in his restricted song-book, the distinctive feature of his poetic world, which is fundamentally elegiac, that is, lowly; reality, the starting-point of every poem, is rarely transfigured so as to reach great heights . . . his lines run on easily and lightly; his style possesses classical elegance and limpidity.'

It is Mr. Cesareo's ambition to be

the first to give his country a complete commentary on Tibullus. His book, however, falls short of his high aspirations. The introduction is passable, pleasantly written, but not extremely erudite. The commentary will be found to be disappointing. This passage and that call forth ecstatic outbursts of admiration, but they are a poor substitute for real exegesis. Textual criticism, and the elucidation of grammatical, metrical and factual difficulties, everything that one looks for in a commentary, are sadly to seek. For the most part we have to be content with bald translation and paraphrase, and his tenuous comments are not free from error. We have seen better work from Mr. Cesareo's pen.

E. H. ALTON.

Trinity College, Dublin.

THE MEDIEVAL LATIN AND ROMANCE LYRIC.

F. BRITTAIN: *The Medieval Latin and Romance Lyric to A.D. 1300*. Pp. xiii + 274. Cambridge: University Press, 1937. Cloth, 15s.

THE aim of this remarkable book is to set out the history of the medieval Latin and Romance Lyric by means of a new kind of anthology. I do not think that anyone has anticipated Mr. Brittain in his idea of presenting in chronological order, irrespective of language, a collection of lyrical pieces in medieval Latin, Provençal, Old French, Castilian, Galician, and Italian from the beginnings to about the year 1300. The result is that the reader who turns these pages has what is almost a visual presentation of the subject. He begins with the *Te Deum* and passes on by way of St. Ambrose and Prudentius to Fortunatus, and then to the Carolingian poets and the *Cambridge Songs*. After Hildebert of Le Mans (d. 1133), he sees the name of Duke William of Aquitaine, the earliest troubadour (d. 1127), and reads his

Pos de chantar m'es pres talenz,

which, as Mr. Brittain points out, is written in the 'Ambrosian' measure with masculine rhymes. So we see one link between the Latin religious

verse and the vernacular. Abelard comes next, in Latin; but Marcabrun and Jaufre Rudel follow, and the Old French makes its entry (after Adam of St. Victor) with a charming anonymous *chanson de toile*,

Lou samedi a soir, fat la semaine.

So the mingling proceeds, with reinforcements from an Anglo-Norman drinking-song (followed by Stephen Langton's *Veni, sancte spiritus*) and King Sancho of Portugal's

Ai eu coitada!

until Italy enters with a *canzone* of Piero delle Vigne (d. 1249). Charming enough is the remaining mixture, with the *Carmina Burana* and such names as Peire Cardenal, Colin Muset, Thibaut IV of Navarre, Thomas of Celano, Jacopone da Todi, Martin Codax, St. Thomas Aquinas, Adam de la Halle and, to crown it all, Dante Alighieri.

The ordinary reader has to struggle with languages which are less familiar to him than to Mr. Brittain, but the editor has done his best to make the path easy by his excellent introductions to each author, and by a very clear and helpful essay on the medieval Latin and Romance Lyric to A.D. 1300. He is

also good enough to give a reference to English translations where these exist. He refers us to J. M. Neale's translation of the *Veni, sancte spiritus*; but I confess to an affection for Miss Catherine Winkworth's, which begins

Holy Ghost, my Comforter,

and seems to me to possess more poetical merit than Neale's.

I do not think that Mr. Brittain (p. 14) deals satisfactorily with the problem of the authorship of *Dulcis lesu memoria*. In his anxiety to claim it for St. Bernard, he brushes aside all the evidence collected by Hauréau and Vacandard, and vaguely asserts that the latest tendency is to revert to the traditional ascription to St. Bernard. I am not aware of any early MS. which makes such an ascription, and even M. Etienne Gilson, who would like to find arguments for ascribing it to Bernard (*Speculum* iii, 1928), contents him-

self with proving, against Hauréau, that it is not a poor poem, a conclusion with which everyone must agree.

Limitations of space obviously precluded a larger illustration of pieces such as Hans Spanke refers to in his *Beziehungen zwischen romanischer und mittellateinischer Lyrik*, but, apart from the absence of any selection from the Ripoll love-songs, Mr. Brittain's choice of Latin lyrics and, so far as my knowledge goes, of the others, leaves little to be desired. In his bibliography, he might have referred to Miss Isabel Pope's article on the 'Mediaeval Latin background of the thirteenth-century Galician Lyric', *Speculum* ix, 1934.

This book of Mr. Brittain's should be of great value to students of medieval literature. It is unnecessary to stress the point that it is not a mere compilation, but a work of fine scholarship such as we are accustomed to expect from him.

F. J. E. RABY.

POSTCLASSICA.

- (1) LÉON HERRMANN: *Querolus*. (See C.R. LII. 48.)
- (2) CARO LYNN: *A College Professor of the Renaissance*. (LI. 208.)
- (3) *Series Archiepiscoporum Cantuariensium*. (LI. 160.)
- (4-6) J. D. P. BOLTON, H. A. P. FISHER, H. THOMSON. (LI. 158.)
- (7) *Prope sacellum Ioannis Pascoli*, etc. (LI. 246.)
- (8) H. D. WATSON: *Jabberwocky*, etc. (*Ibid.*)
- (9) H. K. ST. J. SANDERSON: *Vtraque lingua*. (*Ibid.*)
- (1) A QUEER volume, bibliographically: there is no publisher's name, though we learn that it was printed at Brussels and is the work of a professor of the university of that capital. It includes a text and French translation of this curious and interesting comedy with a valuable apparatus criticus and short but intelligent notes: and a rather elaborate introduction. Professor Herrmann accepts without question that the Rutilius of the dedication is Rutilius Claudius Namatianus, though this is far from certain, and dates the play accordingly: he examines critically but

not unsympathetically Buecheler's contention that it must be of African origin. He makes some interesting suggestions as to its metre, or rather its metrical associations: I think that here he goes too far, for too violent changes are required to bring the *cantica* into strictly metrical form: can we really go beyond Teuffel and Schwabe, who after quoting the passage of the preface naming the 'clodus pes' sum up thus?—'Es laufen nämlich prosaisch begonnene Perioden in metrische (iambische und trochäische) Klauseln aus.' There is a good bibliography, and altogether this is a valuable contribution to the study of a form of Latin poetry at the time when it was not yet, but was very nearly, moving in one of the directions it afterwards took in the Middle Ages.

(2) This was Lucio Marineo Siculo (Lucas di Marinis) of Catania, who studied at Palermo (and Rome) and followed Fadrique Henríquez in 1484 to Spain, where he spent most of the rest of a long life, holding first a professorial chair at Salamanca, and then living at Court, with changing residence

at Medina del Campo, Saragossa, and Burgos. His career is traced in great part by means of extracts (in translation) from his own voluminous writings, and Professor Lynn has succeeded in giving a very lively portrayal of humanistic circles in Spain: where in fact, until the days of the Counter-Reformation, opinion and its expression were as free as anywhere else in Europe. Not that Marineo was tempted by any 'novelty' of doctrine: he was thoroughly orthodox in religion and only a 'liberal' in his pursuit and advocacy of the liberal arts. Special interest attached to his familiarity with Lebrija (Nebrissensis), the greatest scholar of the Spanish Renaissance. The book is, for its subject, perhaps a little long and filled with too many verbal quotations from sometimes dull letters: but it well repays a not too close reading.

(3) This ingenious *memoria technica* in Latin hexameters follows another¹ by the same author on the Popes (noticed in C.R. XLIX. 195). Modern surnames are paraphrased with extraordinary skill: but I will content myself with quoting the account of one of the great archbishops of our earlier days, Theodore of Tarsus (668-690):

Tandem successit Theodorus, sanguine Graecus,

Et Tarsi civis, Paulina natus in urbe
(Sexaginta sex cum iam compleverat annos
Accessit cathedrae, duo vigintique tenebit.
Anno natus erat saeculi labente secundo.)
Vir pius et doctus, duce quo, quo praesule,
flore

Unica pro multis per totam ecclesia terram
Angla, sui tantum similis, penitusque remota.

(4, 5, 6) Oxford prize exercises. Mr. Thomson, in his Menander verse, perhaps allows himself some lengthen-

¹ I understand that a copy of this was sent to the present Pope, and received by His Holiness with a good deal of pleasure.

ings of short vowels before two consonants, the second a liquid, more proper to tragic than to comic iambs.

(7) The Hoeufft prize poems for the past year are 'At Giovanni Pascoli's tomb', by Vincenzo Polidori (several metres, hexameter, elegiac and lyric); 'Through a glass darkly', by Hermann Weller of Tübingen; 'Dulce solum' and 'Horace's first schoolmaster', by Alfredo Bartoli; and 'Satan', by Vittorio Genovesi—this last with great wealth of annotation from the Vulgate, the Classics, and the Fathers; I do not much like *sine morē stuprari*, but the versification seems on the whole sound.

(8) carries on, without excelling, the same writer's *Hunting of the Snark* (noticed C.R. L. 183). I perhaps slightly prefer *The Walrus and the Carpenter* in Sapphics, and there is an amusing *jeu d'esprit* on the subject of one of T. E. Page's last compositions.

(9) Here is some fine stuff in the best tradition of British scholarship: Mr. Sanderson, of Shrewsbury and Cambridge, was the classical sixth-form master at Bedford School from 1890 to 1928, and turned out many charming and even exquisite copies: they have been arranged by Mr. C. W. Baty, the Archbishop of Dublin contributes a short preface, and the author's happy and studious life is described by R. T. Ozanne. I content myself with the rendering of a simple quatrain from Fitzgerald's *Omar Khayyām*—'I sometimes think that never blows so red . . .'

Fallor, an accessit natis rubor inde rosetis
praecipuus, qua ditat humum nutrimine pin-
guem

caesareus cruor: atque hyacinthi quotquot in
hortis

formosi crescent, pulchrae de fronte puellae
dilapsi natale solum subiere capilli.

STEPHEN GASELEE.

GREEK AND LATIN VERSIONS.

(1) W. SHEWRING: *Greek and Latin Versions*. Pp. 111. London: Dent, 1938. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

(2) Sir Alexander LAWRENCE: *Aliunde: Translations and Verses*. Pp. vii + 118. London: Milford, 1938. Cloth, 5s.

(1) THE art of composition is indeed experiencing a renaissance: here is another admirable book of versions, in either tongue. The prose passages are mainly in the style of Demosthenes or Cicero, written in forceful, lordly rhetoric; but, where necessary, Herodo-

tus speculates delightfully upon the silence of giraffes, and among some attractive philosophic pieces a passage from *The story of Wan* is extraordinarily well turned, with just the right nuances; G. M. Hopkins appears, clarified into intelligibility; I admire too the version from Father D'Arcy (p. 42)—surely a *locus classicus* for the use of *τίξεν* (Mr. Tate should note this piece for his atheistical statistics). In Latin, there is also some philosophical prose, and one masterly Tacitean version. Mr. Shewring is quick to adapt the shape of the English to the requisite classical structure; occasionally, however, he transforms rather than translates (cf. pp. 57, 109)—a most instructive method for the intelligent pupil, but probably above the heads of many.

Mr. Shewring is a skilful versifier, and he knows his tragedians through and through (note an apposite adaptation of an Aeschylean fragment on p. 11). For the frivolous, there is an ingenious piece of stichomuthia between Holmes and Watson, which would have made the honest Doctor's eyes goggle: Sherlock might not have been so surprised, one feels, but it might well have wakened Mycroft; and there is a jolly version of a music-hall song. But some of the verses, both Greek and Latin, are difficult: the Latin especially seem sometimes to lack colour, and are apt to stray somewhat from the original, although here too the translator at his best is very good (e.g. p. 61, vv. 9-12; p. 65, vv. 13-16).

Some details may be noticed. On p. 15, for *δορῶν*, read *δοράτων*; p. 17, *κατερρακωμένον* repeats an error found in L. and S.⁹: Mr. Harrison showed (C.R. XLV. 60) that in Sophocles *Tr.* 1103 it is the speaker's *body* that is torn; p. 21, is the epic form *ῥα* admissible in iambs? In the Latin, can *micare* be properly used of mountains (p. 65)? *Noscebare* is curious on p. 69, and the whole piece shows weaknesses; I doubt *utentior* (p. 109—see Holden on Cic. *de off.* ii. 71), and on p. 107 the clause *isto . . . supersessum* is obscure. *Imperitus* is rarely used of things (p. 101).

The book is beautifully printed, and is by way of being an edition *de luxe*, which has its drawbacks as regards

practical handling; unfortunately, four ugly misprints have crept in, and there are some mistakes in accentuation. It is a notable addition to the three books of compositions published last year, and there is much for all to learn from it, although it will possibly be found most valuable by the really advanced student. Of Ampleforth, as of Winchester, one may well say *o fortunatos nimium*: Mr. Shewring's youth may have been 'impatient', but it was sagely spent.

(2) Sir Alexander Lawrence, in collecting his *opuscula subsiciva*, allows us to share a pleasure long known to his colleagues at the Treasury. Here are verse translations from seven languages, original Latin and English verses, and some Greek and Latin versions. Much of this material is outside the scope of this review; I liked, however, a neat rendering from Macchiavelli (p. 57), in which the rhythm and feeling of the original are well reproduced, the amusing translation of Giusti's *La guigliottina a vapore* (p. 63), and the little parody of Blake (p. 93—but why curtail the last line of the stanza?).

Among the purely classical pieces, a vigorous translation of the messenger's speech in the *Persae* attracts the reader's notice, and there are some pleasant versions from Bion and Moschus. The translation (in English sapphics) of Sappho's Ode to Aphrodite is straightforward and conscientious, but the occasional rhymes seem a mistake, and the whole is certainly not so successful as the versions by Edwin Arnold and J. A. Symonds—and in the last stanza, 'love-lorn maiden' is a sad lapse. Perhaps the neatest of the shorter pieces of translation is the Anacreontic version on p. 43, which well maintains the simplicity and the lilt of the Greek. 'Fairshon's Feud' goes well into Homeric hexameters, if with a slightly too stichic tendency here and there.

There are some amusing squibs, such as a dialogue on the 1925 budget in the Westminster elegiac style, and parodies of Horace and Catullus—galliambs are here put to an unsuspected use. The author is not above introducing modernisms such as 'taxibus', 'fabas da', 'trampagium', somewhat in the vein of *Arundines Cami*, but they are all

part of the fun. Altogether this is a happy, unprofessional book, reflecting the ceaseless activity of a curiously versatile mind, 'operosa et semper agens aliquid et moliens'.

One or two points of scholarship arise. On p. 25, would not the digamma make *δυσχερὲς ἔργον* impossible in Sapphics? On p. 85, *φηῶν* is mysterious (is it a modernism?), *Φηροσιδα* *ἄσαντι* involves a dubious elision, and

Σκοτίκης (*sic*; cf. *Δίος* above) is surely an illegitimate form. On p. 99 a word has dropped from the antepenultimate line; and on p. 114, 'Balnearii io comes' is an improbable glyconic verse. In the translation of the *Pervigilium Veneris*, the expression 'broken-hearted lover' in the refrain introduces something quite alien to the spirit of the poem.

R. G. AUSTIN.

University College, Cardiff.

ANCIENT CYPRUS.

Stanley CASSON: *Ancient Cyprus, its Art and Archaeology*. Pp. xii+214; 16 plates, 1 map. London: Methuen, 1937. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

MR. CASSON'S survey of the personality and achievement of ancient Cyprus extends from the Neolithic to the Hellenistic age. It is opportune and stimulating. A strongly reviving interest in the island's antiquities finds here precisely what it can now demand. The bibliography of Cyprus is extensive; each major branch of enquiry has now been treated in an authoritative manner. Thus the labours of Oberhummer in topography, of Professors Myres and Gjerstad in archaeology and in particular in ceramics can never be superseded. Numismatics owe an equal debt to Sir George Hill, sculpture to F. N. Pryce, knowledge of the syllabary and language to Smith, Deecke, Meister and Hoffmann. Few regions of the ancient world have been more extensively (but not exhaustively) excavated; few excavations have been more meticulous than those of the Swedes. It remained to co-ordinate and assess this achievement; and C.'s book, through meeting this demand, receives much of its value.

If I have suggested that C. confines himself to an opportune summary of previous work, I hasten to correct this impression. To a field in which he is a comparative newcomer, he brings a knowledge of the art and archaeology of Greece from the bronze to the classical age, which entitles every considered judgement of his to respect. Where he speaks of the Mycenaean period, this is especially so. Cyprus,

for the majority of scholars, is of interest mainly because of an extreme conservatism which preserves until the fourth century much of Homeric life. C. very rightly insists that in no particular is classical Cyprus the poor relation of Greece. Against the opinion of Gjerstad that all Aegean ware in the island is imported and accordingly that there was no Mycenaean colonization, C. has little difficulty in defending (pp. 46 f., 117 f.) the older view that in the 14th century such a settlement in fact took place. Chronologically, this is the central point in C.'s survey. In a brief account of preceding cultures, C., while appreciative of the importance of Dikaios' researches into the Neolithic settlements of Khirokitia and Erimi, does little justice to the richness and variety of the EB age, as shown by the ceramic finds of Dikaios at Vounous. Thus C. has nothing to say of human and animal decoration in relief, or, among other forms, of the extraordinary composite vases in two tiers; nothing of the terracotta temenos which graphically portrays the sacrifice of a bull to a snake goddess—the most important religious document of prehistoric Cyprus (*Illustrated London News*, 5 Dec. 1931). C. is at fault in stating (pp. 33 f.) that all vessels of this period have a convex basal side, and so cannot stand motionless on a plane surface. See Gjerstad, *Studies on Prehistoric Cyprus*, pp. 90-92; *Ill. Lond. News*, 31 Oct. 1931; *S.C.E.* i, Lapethos, tomb 303a (plate 14, 4).

Between the stone age and the coming of metal, C. supposes a complete break (an argument from negative evidence

which there is reason to think may shortly be disproved). With this exception, he maintains, there runs unbroken through Cypriot history an unmistakable personality, a *Κύπριος χαρακτήρ* (pp. 3 f.). This seems little more than an illicit generalization based on a conservatism especially evident in sculpture and the ceramics of certain periods. Thus epigraphy shows that the syllabary and with it the Arcado-Cypriot dialect was discarded abruptly even in remote villages. I see little or nothing in the Roman period that can be called peculiarly Cypriot.

Ch. 3 is given to an analysis of the Cypriot LB script. Here C. is dealing in part with unpublished material. 61 signs and 5 numerals are illustrated. 16 per cent. of these signs occur in the syllabary. It is convincingly argued that this script is a Mycenaean importation, ultimately to be derived from the Cretan linear; that after long neglect in the dark ages it was revived in the classical script. C.'s treatment of this subject is far more extensive than that of Evans, *P. of M.* iv, ii, 758 f., or of Schaeffer, *Missions en Chypre*, 1936, pp. 119-121; far more sober than that

of Persson, *S.C.E.* iii, App. i (pp. 601-618), and is of fundamental importance. It is surprising that no mention is made by these authorities of Dikaïos' discovery at Vounous of an EB linear script (*Ill. Lond. News*, 10 Dec. 1932).

Ch. 6 contains much of value on the kingship which survived in Cyprus into the Hellenistic period. C. finds in this a relationship with the 'democratic' kingship of the Homeric poems. He justly deplors its neglect at the hands of the excavator, for its descent from the Achaean age cannot be demonstrated archaeologically. The final chapter, devoted to the art of Cyprus, is notable for a brilliant biography of Cypriot sculpture.

P. 118: a glance at Strabo, xiv, 5, 17 will show that the Cilician, not the Cypriot Soli is given as the scene of Amphilocheus' death. On p. 130 Kir. . . is Kurion, but on p. 144 Kyrenia. As for the mysterious Tokhni inscription of p. 97, the rock face on which it is cut is so clean that it can hardly be of any antiquity. The Nicosia Museum contains two interesting forgeries in unknown scripts. T. B. MITFORD.

University of St. Andrews.

DOCUMENTS ON ATHENIAN TRIBUTE.

Benjamin Dean MERITT: *Documents on Athenian Tribute*. Pp. xi+135; 16 figures, 2 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937. Cloth.

THE student who is familiar with Professor Meritt's previous epigraphical work will take up this new volume from his pen with the highest expectations. Nor will he be disappointed. It would be hard to find, hard even to imagine, a more attractive presentation of a work of scholarship than that embodied in this book, with its admirable typography, its brilliant photographs, its effective line-drawings, five of which are in black and red, and its detailed indexes. The content, too, is wholly worthy of the form; its meticulous accuracy, its lucid expression, its cogent argument, its mastery of the relevant materials and its careful distinction between the probable and the proved

render it a model of what such a work should be.

In the first two chapters, which form half the book, the author offers an excellent restoration of two decrees (*I.G.* I². 65, 66) relative to the collection of the Athenian tribute, based upon a detailed examination of the eleven known fragments of the first and three of the second, one of which is here published for the first time. They throw valuable light on the steps taken by Athens to secure payment of sums due from the allies, and incidentally indicate that the *ἐκλογεῖς* frequently mentioned in epigraphical and literary sources were not Athenians but local boards in the various allied cities. Of the two decrees 66 seems to be slightly the earlier, but both fall within the period of the Archidamian War, perhaps 'at some stage in the proceedings connected with the assessment of

425 B.C.' (p. 41). The remaining four chapters deal with the quota-lists and contain a large number of additions to, corrections of, and adjustments in those lists as published by West and Meritt in *S.E.G. V*. The most important of these arise from Wade-Gery's discovery (*B.S.A. XXXIII. 101 ff.*) that what had hitherto been regarded as list VII consists in reality of a summation of list I and a continuation of list II; thus the number of lists on the obverse and the right side of the *lapis primus* is reduced from eight to seven, and one year (probably 449-8 B.C.) is left without any entry. The present work traces the consequences of this startling discovery, restores list VI of 448-7 B.C., reasserts the assignment of lists XXVIII and XXV to 430-29 and 429-8 respectively, and locates a number of fragments hitherto unplaced or wrongly attributed. Insignificant as some of these adjustments may appear at first sight, the total value of the contribution made in this work to the ordering of the quota-lists must be rated very highly.

The proofs have been read with com-

mendable care, and the few errors noted by the present reviewer are either typographical trivialities or slips unlikely to mislead the reader,—the failure, for example, to bracket the H of p. 106, line 10, the derivation of ἐλλείπω from ἐκλείπω rather than from ἐνλείπω on p. 125, and the form ὀφείλῃ on p. 129. Here and there a brief comment might have been added with profit,—e.g., to explain why ἐλληνοταμίαις is restored in *I.G. I². 65. 11* and ἐλληνοταμίαισι in *I². 66. 19* (pp. 27, 51, 56), to discuss the name which the author writes Διόδης (pp. 69, 124), Bechtel Διοδῆς (*Hist. Personenn.* 133) and von Hiller Διώδης (*I.G. I², p. 311*), or to make clear why the Ἐπόδιοι must be ousted from their position in *S.E.G. V. 6 ii 18* (pp. 79, 87). But the reader's chief feelings as he lays down the book are those of admiration for the uncanny skill with which the author handles his difficult materials and of gratitude for the fresh light he has thrown on the history and organization of the Athenian Empire.

MARCUS N. TOD.

Oriel College, Oxford.

GREEK TREATIES OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

F. HAMPL: *Die griechischen Staatsverträge des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Christi Geb.* Pp. 144. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1938. Paper.

In the first half of this volume—a Leipzig *Preisschrift*—Dr. Hampl defines the contents and scope of the principal fourth-century treaties; in the second part he discusses their historical significance. In both sections he establishes some new points and throws out suggestions which invite further discussion. Concerning the 'King's Peace' of 386 he makes the novel conjecture that it emanated from the brain of Agesilaus. It is true that one main result of the peace, the dissolution of the Boeotian League, was a standing article of Agesilaus' policy. But it would have been an amazing volte-face on his part to initiate the scheme of handing back to Persia the Asiatic Greeks, of whom he had heretofore been the most ardent champion.

Hampl aptly points out that the still-born peace of 375/4 was the first genuine attempt to establish a *κοινή εἰρήνη* in Greece, and to provide for collective sanctions against a treaty-breaker. He goes on to offer an attractive explanation of a paradox in the peace of 371, which envisaged sanctions against all aggressors, whether signatories of the treaty or not, yet permitted all signatories to contract out of their obligations in this respect. He suggests that the former clause was a new weapon of Sparta against Thebes (which had stood out of the treaty), and that the latter was inserted at the instance of the Athenians, who were not yet prepared to break with Thebes.

Hampl effectively maintains against recent dissentients that the peace of 362/1 was negotiated without Persian mediation. He seeks to discredit the statement of Diodorus (XV. 90. 2),

that in 362/1 the Spartans refused an alliance with king Artaxerxes, because he had admitted the Messenians to the *κοινὴ εἰρήνη*, as a mere blunder. But this is unnecessary. The reference in Diodorus is probably to the rescript which Pelopidas had brought back from Susa in 367.

Hampl discusses at length the *κοινὴ εἰρήνη* of 338/7. He argues convincingly that the delegates at the new Hellenic *συνέδριον* represented neither cities nor *ἔθνη*, but geographic regions like the *μερίδες* of the Boeotian League. He further contends that the *κοινὴ εἰρήνη* was not supplemented by a *συμμαχία* between the Greeks and Macedon. But he hardly succeeds in disposing of passages in Arrian and Justin which assert or imply such an alliance. The Persian war into which Philip drew the Greeks is represented by Hampl as a deliberate attempt on the king's part to take over the Achaemenid empire, lock, stock and barrel; but his evidence for this is inadequate. The Delphic oracle which assured Philip that 'the bull was ready for the

sacrifice' (Diodorus XVI. 91. 2) hardly suffices to show that he intended to swallow his victim whole. The story of Philodemus, that Aristotle warned Philip not to step into the Achaemenids' shoes, is suspect, for it probably derives from Peripatetic sources, which notoriously exaggerated the vain-gloriousness of the Macedonian rulers.

Hampl concludes with an excursus on the Second Naval Confederacy of Athens. He opposes the current view that in the League's government the *κοινὸν τῶν συμμάχων* and the Athenian Ecclesia constituted two co-ordinate chambers. But this view finds strong support in Demosthenes and Aeschines, both of whom represent the Ecclesia as empowered to confirm or reject resolutions of the allies (Demosthenes, *Fals. Leg.* 144; Aeschines, *Fals. Leg.* 62).

But these criticisms should not obscure the solid merits of Hampl's book, which is closely and carefully argued throughout, and successfully clears up a number of contentious points.

M. CARY.

University of London.

THE ENTRANCE COURT OF THE ACROPOLIS.

Gorham Phillips STEVENS: *The Periclean Entrance Court of the Acropolis of Athens*. Pp. x + 78; 1 plate (frontispiece), 66 figures in the text. Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1936. Cloth, \$2.50 or 7s.

IN the great building scheme of the mid fifth century, are we to suppose that Pericles and his associates had no thought for the general lay-out of the Acropolis? Did they simply aim at creating a masterpiece here and there? This study seeks to prove that they did try to reduce to order the old haphazard plan, by forming on the eastern side of the Propylaea a roughly square court, some forty or fifty yards across, itself rich in monuments, but serving also as a centre from which the visitor would set out to enjoy the rest of the Acropolis. The back of this court was formed by a Mycenaean wall some twelve feet high, which 'was the deciding factor in orienting the Propylaea of Mnesicles.'

Against it stood the colossal bronze Athena of Pheidias whose helmet-crest and spear-head could be seen from the sea. Stevens shows ingeniously and for the first time why ancient sailors could not have seen more—the stoai of the Brauronian precinct prevented it, and they also hid much of that view of the Parthenon which would otherwise have been—and is now—seen from the eastern portico of the Propylaea.

In reconstructing this precinct and other buildings, and in determining the position of various monuments, full use is made (as by others) of the account of Pausanias; but, especially where he is silent, much is deduced from the cutting or wearing of the rock—for instance, the existence and importance of the smaller court on the west of the Parthenon, and of the propylon which admitted to it. On the architectural side the book displays all the patient scrutiny and

controlled conjecture we are accustomed to expect from the writer. The limitation to the Periclean period is, however, not observed strictly enough, and—a curious lapse this—there should be no grave-stelae on the Acropolis at any period within the purview of the classical archaeologist.

On the sculptural side, where he has relied less on his own researches, he is less happy and less up to date. Hermes in the Propylaea is 'probably a statue' (whereas the evidence points to its having been a herm); if Diitrephes died in 409 he cannot have been shown

dying in a statue by Cresilas or on a black-figured lekythos (the difficulties of this old problem are ignored): and, most curious of all, the 'serene and noble face' of Pericles turns out to be that of an unknown, the printer having copied the wrong picture from another book.

It should not be thought, however, that these errors and others like them, in the more summary part of the work, do more than mar its surface. Mr. Stevens reads stones better than proofs.

BERNARD ASHMOLE.

University College, London.

THE CITIES OF THE EASTERN ROMAN PROVINCES.

A. H. M. JONES: *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*. Pp. xv + 576; 6 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937. Buckram, 35s.

MR. JONES'S great work renders accessible an enormous amount of information concerning the urbanization of the area eventually covered by the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire (with the exception of the Greek homeland, Macedon, Achaia, and Crete, but including Cyprus) in the period, from the fifth century B.C. to Justinian, in which the Graeco-Roman civilization ran its course. He includes an exhaustive account of the administrative system in those areas which were never, or only partly, urbanized. This is especially valuable in providing the first detailed survey of the bureaucratic system of the Hellenistic world as a whole, supplemented by a scattered discussion of the administrative notions of the Roman government that superseded the monarchies.

Though J. leaves to a later volume a fuller treatment of the internal development of the Cities, he says enough to show that by City or πόλις he means any self-governing unit in which the government of a rural area is directed from an urban centre. For him the existence of a Council is decisive. To term this unit a πόλις is a little misleading, but in the East the usage is inevitable, and without this broad definition J.'s subject would have lacked unity. He thus seeks to show

that the urbanization of the East at its formal maximum in the sixth century A.D. is the last stage of a continuous process that had begun before the fourth century B.C. But he deals not so much with the πόλις as with the L.C.M. of what the Hellenic and the Hellenistic world understood by πόλις. There is a transition of theory in the course of this period from a Greek to a Latin notion of the City, a transition which is not adequately explained by J.'s occasional references to actual 'Romanization' of municipal constitutions. The instances quoted are somewhat unconvincing and scanty, especially for Asia: in *Pro Flacco* 42-43 Cicero is exploiting the ignorance of his audience, much as in *De Leg. Ag.* II 92-93, and shows no special knowledge of the Asiatic system; in Cyprus there is a single reference to the censorial recruitment of a Council, Ch. XIII n. 12. Although the references to the *lex Pompeia* in the letters of Pliny are adequate to prove the change in the nature of the Councils in Bithynia and Pontus, there is nothing to show how the popular courts and assemblies were eliminated in general, and how the notions latent within the *lex Pompeia* were applied to the City system as a whole. The transition was perhaps due not so much to formal changes as to the difference between the attitude of the Kings and that of Rome. For the latter the City was the normal, and no longer the occasional, basis of administration. J. brings out

this factor very clearly, and will doubtless discuss the problem fully in his second volume.

Within the limits set his treatment is exhaustive, almost too exhaustive for the non-specialist; but he is skilful in subordinating to his narrative the inevitable mass of minor discussion, and holds the balance between text and notes, which are a model of conciseness without omission; for he makes no undocumented assertions. His narrative is most successful when dealing with areas such as Lycia, whose history can be reduced to that of their component parts. The discussion of the Egyptian *metropoleis* will provide a valuable introduction to those who have been frightened off this subject by the complexity and obscurity of many

modern studies of it. Only in the treatment of the lands beyond Euphrates are J.'s limits unsatisfactory. He properly excludes the Iranian plateau, but his description of Mesopotamia suffers from the omission of the Greek cities of the south, where the longevity of the original *πόλις* type, despite adverse conditions, contrasts with what happened elsewhere. Incidentally, the documentary sources suggest that the 'philhellenic' policy of the Parthians was more successful than J. and Dio admit.

The book is beautifully produced. Except in the maps only one misprint, Loadicea for Laodicea on p. 251, was noticed, and one slip: Olympus on p. 103 should be 'south', not 'north', of Phaselis. A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE.

St. John's College, Oxford.

THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF SUSSEX.

E. Cecil CURWEN: *The Archaeology of Sussex*. Pp. xviii + 338; 32 plates; 89 text illustrations. ('The County Archaeologies.') London: Methuen, 1937. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

It is good news that Messrs. Methuen have ceased to despair of the archaeological public, and all will hope that this new addition to 'The County Archaeologies' will never accompany its predecessors to the 'Remaindered' shelf. It certainly does not deserve this fate. In fact, the excellent geological description (always desperately difficult to write so as to be at once concise and readable) is a fitting prelude to a fine account, valuable to students of the Roman Empire who are anxious (as all should be) to see its history in the perspective gained by a study of the prehistoric life on which it impinged.

Such a study is bringing interesting results: the abandonment of Cissbury and the Trundle for a coastal-plain capital, perhaps, as the author suggests, at Selsea originally rather than at Chichester, is the work of the Belgae, who are seen here as forerunners of Roman principles of urban foundation. The contrast between the Belgic 'nation' of West Sussex and the hill-fort dwellers of the Caburn (a site abandoned and never even replaced

under the Empire) illuminates the circumstances of the Roman conquest. A French reviewer finely said of the now famous article of Hawkes and Dunning (*Arch. Journ.* lxxxvii) that 'history had won important ground from pre-history'. Dr Curwen carries on their work, so that in this little corner of the Roman Empire we can almost write the history from the point of view of the conquered.

But when the conquest is finished, and Roman Sussex is to be recorded, Dr Curwen, one is bound to say, disappoints. Can it be that, like some prehistorians, he is bored with Roman Britain? The facts are presented in a somewhat mechanical way, and, for the first time in the book, are not clearly related to general principles. It is not easy to see how the general reader, without knowledge of Roman Britain, would make much of them. Yet they are interesting, for Roman Sussex has features rare, if not unique, in Roman Britain, so that there were chances to seize. The Chichester tombstones, for instance, throw interesting and rather unexpected light on Romanization in the territory of Cogidumnus. Two of the three have Roman 'nomina', are tombstones, in fact, of Roman citizens; and the proportion, though too small, of

course, to constitute a fair sample, is strikingly different from the average North Gallic town, where 'tria nomina' are rare. The treatment of the villages is good (perhaps because their life is really a continuing prehistory), though it is not correct to say that window-glass and wall-plaster are only found among villages at Park Brow: but that of the villas is marred by the absence of any plan to tell the general reader (for whom the book is intended) what a villa is like. The same may be said of the Saxon-shore forts, where reference to the 'Honorius' tile of Pevensey, probably the latest inscription of Roman Britain, might have been included. And the absence of a chapter upon the

pagan Saxons is a disappointment indeed; the problem of continuity between Roman and Saxon Britain is one of the hardest that archaeologists have to solve, and it is from the Saxon end that the greatest promises of solution come.

But I should not like this review of a fine book to end in carping. It is the product of a rich, sensitive, and imaginative mind; it will bring home to classical scholars that there was among the peoples that Rome subdued a development of culture that was unknown to the man- or even the historian-in-the-street in Rome.

C. E. STEVENS.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

Hermathena, No. L. Pp. 245. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis and Co. (London: Longmans), 1937. Paper, 6s.

In the first article of this issue Mr. J. Tate pursues a complicated argument on the well-known subject of the meaning and explanation of *κἀπαρσις* in Aristotle's *Poetics*. In the first four pages he says almost all that can profitably be said by way of interpreting the passage, and it may be doubted whether much more is to be gained by working out more minute physiological explanations—not so worked out by Aristotle himself—on the basis of passages of which the most important (*Problems* XXX) is probably only partially Aristotelian, while others are Platonic. But at least Mr. Tate shows the difficulties in views put forward by some other scholars, and discusses in an interesting manner the truth of the view expressed by (or attributed to) Aristotle.

Mr. David Grene gives a competent survey of the comic technique of Aristophanes. I have not been able to detect anything new in the article, and it contains some not very successful polemic against Dr. Gilbert Murray and against the views of Süss in regard to stock characters in primitive comedy. (Mr. Grene acknowledges the *βωμολόχος*, but repudiates the *αλαζών*.) He is perhaps unnecessarily puzzled by the series of disconnected scenes in the second half of many comedies. But the greater part of the article covers the familiar ground systematically and readably, and those who require a brief and convenient sketch of the development of the poet's art may do worse than look for it here.

A note by Mr. W. H. Porter on Euripides *Rhesus* 717-721 proposes what appears to me to be a convincing change of punctuation.

Near the end of the volume are a number of translations into Greek and Latin verse. Some of these, particularly the shorter Latin pieces, read pleasantly enough; but there are passages which would themselves be almost untranslatable without the help of the English (especially

in the rendering of a passage from *Much Ado*), and some odd expressions here and there. *σκορπίων ἀναστρόφη* reads like parody, and what are *παραίολοι τρόποι*?

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

University of Sheffield.

Homeri *Ilias*, *Odyssea*. Ediderunt BRUVN, SPOELDER. Pp. 958. Haarlem: Willink (London: Milford), 1937. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

THIS book contains a text of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* unencumbered with notes or critical apparatus or indeed anything in the nature of helps for the reader, except that the editors have enclosed some lines (of which A 265 is typical) in square brackets, and have distributed marks of punctuation with truly continental generosity (A 348, ἢ δ' ἀέκουσ' ἄμα τοῖσι, γυνή, κίεν). The text is beautifully printed in a bold erect type on thin but sufficiently opaque paper. The only criticism which the production invites is that the inner margins are rather too narrow, and the longer lines appear to be slightly squeezed. It is right that such a text as this should be deliberately conservative. *Nihil contra fontes* must have been the editors' motto. Only very exceptionally do they make such a concession to the scruples of grammarians as *συμβλήκει* (Y 335, Dindorf, for *συμβλήσεται*). The choice of readings is competent and sound, though the reader is bound to feel occasional regret that the variant which he prefers has not commended itself to the editors; for example, I do not care for *λομοῖο* etc. at A 97. I have noticed no misprints save for the infrequent omission of an apostrophe (as at I 414, Φ 525).

As I have indicated, the editors are very reticent—even to the point of suppressing their own initials. They are Dr. J. C. Bruyn, Rector of the Vossius Gymnasium in Amsterdam, and Dr. C. Spoelder, Rector of the Public Gymnasium in Haarlem. I am informed by the publishers that the type was specially designed for this edition, and that the book is now in use in most of the Dutch schools. It is not likely that

so handsome a book will be required to do similar service in Britain. But to anyone, whether student or teacher, who wishes to subject himself to the salutary discipline of the plain text—whether to read or to expound—this edition can be recommended with complete confidence.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

Wilhelm SCHNEIDEWIN: *Das sittliche Bewusstsein. Eine Gorgias-analyse*. Pp. 54. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1937. Paper. M. 2.80.

THIS is not an 'analysis' in any ordinary sense. The term may suggest that the argument is to be dissected into 'stages' with frosty calmness, or that memories are to be stimulated and examiners satisfied. Either of these impressions would, in this case, be quite incorrect. The 'analyst' speaks to us in a fanciful and elevated tone, with many an allusion to Goethe; he often speaks in the first person, as one clothed in the mantle of Socrates; and by a natural device he makes the dialogue a drama in which the right side wins, and Socrates is able 'den falschen Weltgeist zu besiegen und für die Sittlichkeit das Feld zu behaupten'. The work, therefore, scarcely offers a solid handle for criticism, but I should be unfair if I did not say that I had found it readable and stimulating.

D. J. ALLAN.

Balliol College, Oxford.

Hans SCHWEIZER: *Aberglaube und Zauberei bei Theokrit*. Pp. 56. Basel: Boehm, 1937. Paper.

THIS doctoral dissertation, though it touches on other allusions to magic and superstition in Theocritus, is mainly concerned with Simaetha's proceedings in *Id.* 2, which it illustrates much more fully than has hitherto been done in print, making good use of the magic papyri. In numerous points of detail, for instance the purpose of the laurels and the wool in 1 f., considerable doubt is permissible. I do not always find myself in agreement with Dr. Schweizer's interpretations, and his view that the *ῥόμβος* of 30 is a top seems to me positively perverse, but in general his discussion is lucid and reasonable and I have noticed few omissions.¹ His dissertation should be very useful to any future editor who shrinks from the task of familiarizing himself with the now extensive literature of ancient magic.

Appended to the dissertation is yet another attempt to solve that tiresome enigma Philetas fr. 10.

A. S. F. GOW.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

¹ At 58 the use of lizards in *φιδρα* should have been discussed (see Abt, *Die Apol. d. Apuleius*, p. 109). Dr. Schweizer well defends Theocritus from the charge of confusing *Liebesszauber* and *Schadenzauber*, but makes Simaetha more vindictive than I think her. I take the *κακὸν ποτόν* of 58 to be a dangerous love-philtre (see, e.g., Antiphon 1. 9, Arist. *Magn. Mor.* 1188b 31), and *Schadenzauber* to be in her mind, if at all, only at 161.

E. DIEHL: *Der Digressionsstil des Kallimachos*. (Abhandlungen der Herder-Gesellschaft und des Herder-Instituts zu Riga, Fünfter Band, Nr. 9.) Pp. 27. Riga: Akt.-Ges. 'Ernst Plates', 1937. Paper.

AS Callimachus frequently *die Erzählung (den Fluss der Darstellung) durch Abschweifungen unterbricht*, Mr. Diehl seeks to serve the reconstruction of the *Aetia* by studying his procedure in this respect. First, two Hymns of differing types, I and V, are fully analysed; then classes of digression are distinguished, and most of them illustrated from both Hymns and Fragments—Long Digressions, Parentheses, the poet's Self-interruptions, etc. The less obvious classes are carefully characterized, some sub-groupings established, available recognition-signs noted. Towards reconstructing a lost poem, *die durch Abgleiten eingeleiteten Nebenbemerkungen* (ill expounded) and Long Digressions seldom help, being rarely recognizable as alien to the main theme; all the other classes, with some sagely-marked restrictions, Diehl would either completely disregard or count only as 'indirect sources'.

I see little help for the *Aetia* in this stylistic test. Most of Schneider's fragments entirely elude it; and how (e.g.) should we apply it to the Self-interruption Fr. 136, if still isolated? Assume a place in *der Fluss der Darstellung*, still largely unknown? Or ignore it? Or use it as an 'indirect source'—how and for what? Also, some of Diehl's criteria are unreliable, and many of his examples seem dubious or wrong. Grouping of *Nebenbemerkungen* (pp. 25-6), by disregarding Callimachus' diversity in using Relatives, wrongly includes some Defining ones (e.g. Fr. 495); and Fr. 32 (Continuative) belongs to an explained rite, and thus to main narrative. In other groups, Fr. 24a has odd 'proof'; Fr. 188 should probably rank like Fr. 32; Fr. 13a is obscurely explained. *Long Digressions*: II. 22-4 digress no more than 18-21; IV. 30-40 fall oddly here (incidental element in main theme; with 41-50, in preliminary contrast with 51-4; cf. Fr. 471 and roughly Fragg. 108 and 84—this last probably not Negative Parenthesis, but incidental in the poem of *Διωνύσιος*, col. IX. 32-8). Lack of space precludes further details. It also allows only brief mention of some illuminating remarks and interesting asides which one is glad to have seen.

M. T. SMILEY.

University College, London.

M. GABATHULER: *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter*. Pp. x+112. (Basler Dissertation.) St. Gallen: Selbstverlag des Verfassers (Notherstrasse, 22), 1937. Paper, 4.50 fr. In this useful dissertation Dr. Gabathuler has edited in chronological order ninety-six Greek epigrams in which the authors, who range from Plato to Meleager, commemorate other Greek poets, legendary, classical, or contemporary, or on occasion themselves. Most of the pieces come from the Palatine and Planudean Anthologies, but fourteen are derived from various other Greek authors, and one (No. 28) from *P. Hamb.* 312. Three fragments of Callimachus (74a, 74b, 74) are included as Nos. 21-3.

The appearance of Plato in a collection of Hellenistic writers is justified by the influence which his three epigrams on Aristophanes, Sappho, and Pindar exerted on later exponents of this genre. The text of the poems is accompanied by an apparatus which, while it omits minutiae of the MSS, includes references to modern editions and other relevant literature and many parallels from Greek authors. Part 2 contains a separate commentary on each epigram, in which special problems are elucidated, and a short *Rückschau* sums up. These epigrams on poets are not among the happiest efforts of the Greek Muse, and the conventional laudations of Orpheus, Homer, or Anacreon make dull reading. But the writers' appreciations of their contemporaries or immediate predecessors are interesting, and even the more academic pieces sometimes contain matter of importance for literary history. In any case Dr. Gabathuler has performed his task with care and judgment. He has a very good knowledge of the modern literature on the subject, and the references to it in the apparatus and commentary would alone make his work valuable. There are few omissions, though he might have discussed the authenticity of the two epigrams on Sophocles (Nos. 6 and 7 in his edition), here assigned to Simias of Rhodes. Misprints are rare and, except in the apparatus to 8.2 (where *ἐναύονται* should be read), never misleading. E. A. BARBER.

Exeter College, Oxford.

C. DEL GRANDE: *Poesia ermetica nella Grecia antica*. Pp. viii+81. Naples: Ricciardi, 1937. Paper, L. 10.

THE title of this monograph is derived from a use of *ermetismo* as a term of contemporary literary criticism to describe the making of a new language (p. 10), 'il quale poi ha la nota propria nel fatto che la parola, pure violata nel suo senso schietto, mai perde totalmente l'accezione primitiva per la seconda cui è devoluta'. Del Grande illustrates this in a most interesting manner from Callimachus, while finding it absent from contemporary epic and bucolic and almost absent from contemporary didactic poetry: it is anticipated in Timotheus and earlier in Pindar. Students of the history of metaphor should certainly note the monograph, bearing in mind the extraordinary fluidity of the Greek use of words in general and the fact that the Greeks were not, like readers of *C.R.*, trained in rendering words and phrases into other languages. But they should hesitate to accept the dictum (p. 71) 'Tutto tende a far ritenere che l'ermetismo verbale letterario nacque come filiazione collaterale dello stilo delle liturgie misteriche'. In the next sentence Del Grande refers to the advent of Dionysiac religion. That is reasonable, for the Dionysiac movement may fairly be associated with a release from traditionalism and an increased readiness for self-expression. But what was the 'lingua dei misteri' (72)? The Orphic tablets are subsequent to the development of lyric: and their pregnant expression derives its force from the fact that to a believer a brief phrase recalled a whole con-

NO. CCCLXXV. VOL. LII.

text, whereas a literary artist, except when alluding to phrases coined by earlier writers, had to create the impression which he wished his words to produce.

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK.

Harvard University.

Z. A. GLAVA: *A Study of Heliodorus and his Romance the Aethiopica, with a Critical Evaluation of his Work as a Serious Source of Information on Ancient Aethiopia*. Pp. 20. Published under the auspices of the Graduate School of New York University. Paper.

MISS GLAVA defends H.'s geography against Naber's attacks (where it is wrong the text may be corrupt, p. 9), and his general account of Ethiopian institutions against the suspicions of others, partly on the grounds that some ancient corroboration can be found for most of what he says, partly on the unjustified, and probably unjustifiable, assumption that he was of Ethiopian descent (p. 1) and personally acquainted with the country (p. 7). The evidence more readily supports the view that he is at best a second-hand authority, at worst a writer to whom effect was of more importance than truth. To judge from the brief introduction, the full dissertation, of which these twenty pages are a section, is as naive in argument and as meagre in results.

R. M. RATTENBURY.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Silva LAKE: *Family II and the Codex Alexandrinus: the text according to Mark*. (*Studies and Documents* ed. K. Lake and S. Lake, V.) Pp. xi+158. London: Christophers, 1936. Paper, 15s.

THIS admirable study carries the history of the Byzantine, or, as von Soden calls it, the K (i.e. *Κοινή*) text a stage further. Von Soden had identified some 29 MSS (among which he included A, Codex Alexandrinus) as a group attesting an early form of the K text which he believed to have been used in the commentary of 'Victor of Antioch' on Mark, by Titus of Bostra in his commentary on Luke, and by Chrysostom in his Homilies on John. Kirsopp Lake and Huffman have since identified more MSS as belonging to the group. Mrs Lake now shows that almost all these MSS undoubtedly form a single family descending from one archetype which may almost certainly be identified with the ix cent. uncial II; and further that A is not a member of this family, though A and II must have a common ancestor (x). x differed from A in having a larger proportion of Caesarean readings. Mrs Lake throws out the interesting suggestion that the text of x may have represented the recension of Lucian.

The reconstruction of the family text and the tables and collations in the appendices are models of method, and the whole study opens out fresh lines of enquiry into the process by which the ecclesiastical text was eventually fixed and stabilized. Of even greater interest are the problems connected with the earlier textual history of the N.T. Mrs Lake now

K

distinguishes within the Caesarean text. She wishes to restrict the term 'Caesarean' to the text used by Origen and Eusebius and best attested by Θ and 565. Now the text of *x* was closer to fam. 1 and fam. 13 than to Θ and 565. The question is thus raised whether *x* descended from a true Caesarean text which was blended with Alexandrian influences such as are also found in fam. 1 and fam. 13, or whether it should be regarded as a witness to a 'pre-Caesarean' text. Mrs Lake expresses a tentative preference for the former alternative.

J. M. CREED.

St. John's College, Cambridge.

Philo, with an English translation by F. H. COLSON. In nine volumes. Volume VII. Pp. xviii+641. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), 1937. Cloth, 10s.

FEW of a reviewer's duties are so congenial as the opportunity of congratulating Mr. Colson on the publication of another volume. He here fully maintains the high standard which he has set; the translation and notes show at every turn a mastery of Philonic usage and an unflinching determination to find and state what Philo meant; and the introduction does full justice to the character of the three books *De specialibus legibus*. They belong to what might be called the 'exoteric' portion of Philo's work.

Among the many points of interest in the subject-matter I note II 63 on the two main heads in the Law—duty to God and duty to man; III 1-3 on Philo's absorption in administrative business and wistful regrets for the days when he could devote himself wholly to study; III 40-1 on ἀνδρόγυνοι and their prominent place in religious ceremonies, and on religious eunuchs, who are described as those of the group who push this spirited conduct to all lengths (cf. Cumont, *L'Egypte des astrologues* 83 n. 5, 133 n. 2 for the equation of *cinaedi* and *galli*. Philo's phrase <τὰ> δῆμιοντος ὁρμήσοντας must, I think, be a confusion on his part between Demeter and Cybele: he saw paganism from the outside, and both goddesses were 'mothers').

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK.

Harvard University.

H. MARKOWSKI: *Diatagma Kaisaros de Caesare Manium turum vindice*. (Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, Prace Komisji Filologicznej, Tom. VIII. Zeszyt 2.) Pp. iii+119; 6 photographs. Poznań, 1937. Paper.

THIS monograph is a valuable study of the famous inscription, sent from Nazareth to Froehner in 1878 and published by Cumont, *Rev. Hist.* 163, 1930, 241 ff.:¹ it records an 'ordinance of Caesar' on tomb-violation and provides the penalty of death. The lettering is generally agreed to lie between the Augustan

age and the middle of the first century of our era. Markowski, who adduces valuable parallels, places it early in the rule of Augustus—in fact, before Octavian had acquired that title: but the argument from the use of *Kaisar* without *Σεβαστός* is not decisive, and style seems to bar M.'s suggestion (p. 73) that Nicolaus of Damascus may have been the translator of the Latin original. Further, I do not think that we can accept either the interpretation of lines 20-2 as directed against informers who fail to prove their case, or the suggestion that there is earlier a reference to a diversity of views on survival after death. At the same time, the epigraphic parallels, the linguistic commentary, and the analysis of the penalties applied at various times under the Empire to tomb-violators, are welcome and useful.

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK.

Harvard University.

C. MARÓT: *Refrigerium* (Acta Litterarum ac Scientiarum Reg. Universitatis Hung. Francisco-Josephinae. Sectio Geographica-Historica. Tom. III. Fasc. 2. Pp. 95-163). Szeged, 1937. Paper, P. 2.

THIS monograph is printed both in Hungarian and in German, but those who, like the reviewer, can use only the latter must turn to the first for references in footnotes which are not repeated. Marót's work is a useful contribution to the type of semantics which is at the same time the history of religion. In the Canon of the Roman Mass the priest desires daily for the Christian dead *locum refrigerii, lucis, et pacis*. This 'refreshment' has a long history, and those interested in it should turn to this study.¹

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK.

Harvard University.

Kenneth W. CLARK: *A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America*. Pp. xxx+420; 73 plates. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1937. Cloth, 22s. 6d.

AMERICAN readers will probably be as surprised as others to learn that there are two hundred and fifty-six Greek MSS of portions of the New Testament in the United States and Canada. Dr Clark is much to be congratulated on this result of his extensive and painstaking researches as well as on the fact that he has secured so admirable a foreword from a scholar of the eminence of Edgar J. Goodspeed. The MSS, of course, vary in age and character, from veterans like the Michigan (Chester Beatty) Pauline *codex* and the Washington Gospels (W) to two of the seventeenth century. It would be hard to praise the present volume too highly. The order of the MSS follows the alphabetical order of the names of the libraries in which they are contained. The description gives in each case the numbers of Gregory, Scrivener, Von Soden and Von Dobschütz, if the MS was known to these

¹ A convenient discussion by F. de Zulueta, *J.R.S.*, 22. I may refer to my longer review of Markowski and of S. Lösch, *Diatagma Kaisaros*, to appear in *Am. J. Phil.*

¹ As also to E. R. Goodenough, *J. Bibl. Lit.* 57, 1938, 104 ff.

scholars, with contents, measurements, a statement whether it has been collated or not, and if so, by whom, a brief account of the provenance and recent history of the MS. and a bibliography chronologically arranged. Interesting colophons are also recorded in full. All this is done in a way that for neatness and clearness I have never seen surpassed. It is gratifying that there are still private collectors both able and anxious to purchase MSS either from Paris or from elsewhere. As Dr Clark has collated many of the MSS, it may be assumed that he proposes later to publish his results, to the clarification of the history of the transmission of the Greek New Testament. The facsimiles are beautifully executed and will be welcome to the palaeographer.

In the dedication VIGINTI ANNOS would be better than ANNIS VIGINTI. It might have been remarked (p. 1) that the first colophon is an iambic senarius (so p. 35); on p. 83, use 'minuscule' rather than 'cursive'; p. 152, reference to Lake not given; p. 166, misprint: p. 194, for 'Lawson' read 'Lamson'; p. 203, for 'Eberhardt' read 'Eberhard'; p. 204, for 'Edwin' read 'Erwin' and for 'Literatur' read 'Literarisches'.

The set of nine detailed indexes deserves grateful mention. A. SOUTER.
Oxford.

Norma L. DRABKIN: *The Medea Exul of Ennius*. Pp. 94. Geneva, N.Y.: W. F. Humphrey Press, 1937. Paper.

MRS. DRABKIN has chosen a small field for her doctoral dissertation, but she has bestowed a vast amount of honest labour upon it and has left practically nothing that was worth saying unsaid. Her introduction discusses the question whether Ennius wrote two plays or one about Medea; she concludes that he wrote only one but that he may have used two Euripidean plays, *Medea* and *Aegeus*. In support of this view she examines the methods of Roman writers in translating Greek tragedies and gives an analysis of Ennius' own practice, based on a detailed comparison of the fragments of his *Medea*, *Iphigenia*, *Hecuba* and *Eumenides* with their originals. The commentary on the fragments occupies the most of forty pages. It is perhaps overloaded with learning, and references (given, in the American manner, in full) are piled high on one another, but that is the fault rather of the genre than of the author. Though often prolix, it is accurate and sound, and, while it contains little that is new, the student of early Latin will find much useful information conveniently concentrated in it.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

J. W. FUCHS: *Index Verborum in Ciceronis de Inventione Libros II*. Pp. 158. 1937. Paper. To be had of the author at Billitonstraat 11, The Hague.

THE first part of this useful and reliable index was reviewed in C.R. LI. 39 when it appeared as a doctoral thesis. The title-page bears a

salutary warning: SI QVIS HVNC INDICEM INSPEXERIT NEQVE IPSIVS CICERONIS VERBA INSPEXERIT, SI EVM INDEX FEFELLERIT, IVRE DECEPTVS ESTO. C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

G. J. ten VELDHUYS: *De misericordiae et clementiae apud Senecam philosophum usu atque ratione*. Pp. viii+119. Groningen: Wolters. Paper.

THE Latin of the title, which fairly represents the style throughout, is, I think, intended to mean 'On the use of the words *misericordia* and *clementia* in the works of Seneca the philosopher and the account which he gives of the things denoted by those words'. Strictly only 68 of the 127 pages deal with the subject (which is rather slight for a doctoral thesis), and even these 68 are filled out with copious quotation and repetition.

The first part of the work deals with *misericordia* in general and its treatment by predecessors of Seneca, Stoics and others. Much of it is inconclusive: it requires nearly ten pages to decide that we can only guess about the views of Panaetius and Posidonius on this question. It would have been much better if the background to the treatment of the main subject had been an orderly account of the treatment of ethics in general by Seneca and other Stoics. Yet before giving that Mr. ten Veldhuys would have had to improve on the view expressed on p. 7: 'cuiusque systematis moralis finis est mortalibus . . . aduersus uitae incommoda . . . dare auxilium.'

The main conclusions of the work are: Seneca, like earlier Stoics, holds that the Wise Man will not feel *misericordia* (though he cannot avoid the irrational movement which is its beginning), yet he will perform the same good actions to which *misericordia* leads others; in contrast with the earlier Stoics, Seneca permits *clementia*, defining it, for example, as 'moderatio aliquid ex merita ac debita poena remittens.' (Mr. ten Veldhuys does not succeed, though the task is surely not a difficult one, in reconciling this virtue with the virtue of Justice to which it is apparently opposed.)

Throughout there are minor blemishes, including errors in grammar, obscurity in the argument, and doubtful interpretations.

M. J. BOYD.

Queen's University, Belfast.

Selected Letters of Pliny. Edited by Hubert McNeill POTEAT. Pp. x+224. New York, etc.: Heath (London, Harrap), 1937. Cloth. 3s.

THIS edition of 123 of Pliny's Letters is intended primarily for undergraduates who have little Latin and need constant encouragement to see them through. Professor Poteat therefore deliberately attempts to make his notes as lively as he can, and reduces references to a minimum. He is more concerned with sense than with syntax, and weak Latinists may at times find it difficult to fit his free translations to the text. He has a wide knowledge of Pliny's social back-

ground, and is an interesting commentator on persons and institutions; but in his references to the 'bad' emperors he outdoes Suetonius. Claudius was a 'poor fool', who 'inclined to history and wrote endless rubbish both in Latin and in Greek'. Domitian's principate was characterized by an 'insane orgy of extravagance', and his spies 'flitted like obscene bats about the city'.

The author's translations occasionally run to seed. 'The person who told me the story is a man whose reputation for veracity cannot be impugned' is an alarming begetting from 'magna auctori fides'. In his anxiety to interest the reader he has at times included too much in his notes, underlining Pliny's character where it might better speak for itself. We think too that the students he has in mind would have been better served by an arrangement of the letters in sections according to subject matter.

Good popularization is more valuable but more difficult than pedantry. Though Professor Poteat has not completely succeeded, many undergraduates will find him a very genial and helpful companion.

R. MEIGGS.

Keele College.

Harald HAGENDAHL: *La prose métrique d'Arnobé*. Contributions à la connaissance de la prose littéraire de l'Empire. Pp. xi + 265. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift XLII, 1936: 1.) Göteborg: Wettergren och Kerber, 1936. Paper, Kr. 10.

IN examining the 'metrical prose' of Arnobius, Hagendahl has followed the method of De Groot. Out of 1,760 clausulae 1,421 (or 80.8 per cent.) belong to the types - u - - u, - u - - u u, - u - - u. In 'non-metrical' prose-writers the percentage is about 25, in Cicero about 49. So we find in Arnobius a tendency characteristic of the evolution of prose-rhythm under the Empire, the tendency to replace the richness and variety of metrical forms in artistic prose of the classical age by a system in which poverty of forms, monotony, and lack of freedom are the outstanding features (p. 22).

Further, of these 1,760 clausulae 1,565 (or 88.9 per cent.) agree with the three principal forms of the 'cursus' so far as accentuation is concerned (p. 78). In the vast majority of these cases the clausulae have the regular metrical forms, but the metrical system is not dominant as it was in earlier prose. Accent has not only become a factor equal in importance to quantity, but sometimes it has won the victory over its rival. In short, Arnobius' prose clearly shows how the rhythmical (accentual) system arose out of the metrical (quantitative) system, and is in process of becoming independent of the latter.

Such are the author's general conclusions. The second part of the book is devoted to a detailed investigation of the influence of rhythm on Arnobius' language.

I have space for only one or two criticisms. Although Hagendahl recognizes the importance of determining the part played by accent in the formation of metrical clausulae (p. 26), he vitiates his discussion by the assumption of an

'ictus', and seems to have only a partial knowledge of the results of previous investigation on this subject. Thus he comes to the extraordinary conclusion (p. 86) that the marked agreement between Cicero's prose and 'non-metrical' prose in the matter of the last two accented syllables of the period proves that in Cicero the accent plays no part in the formation of the clausulae!

Again, Hagendahl takes no account of the comparative method followed by Zieliński and elaborated by Novotný and the present writer. Until the fiction of 'non-metrical' prose, regarded as a basis of comparison, is abandoned, it seems to me little real progress is possible in the investigation of the history of prose-rhythm.

H. D. BROADHEAD.

Canterbury College, Christchurch, N.Z.

Aurelius Augustinus *De Magistro*, ingeleid, vertaald en toegelicht door Dr. G. E. A. M. WIJDEVELD. Pp. viii + 194. Amsterdam: Paris, 1938. Paper, fl. 3.50.

THE present edition of the *De Magistro* of Augustine, a somewhat trivial dialogue on the Platonic model, consists of introduction, bibliography, text, translation into Dutch, a French summary of the introduction, and an index to the notes. It is, so far as I know, the first separate edition of the treatise. The introduction discusses, with learning and judgement, the problems involved. The text is said to be based on the later Migne edition, but the editor has wisely had recourse on occasion to the Benedictine, from which that edition ultimately descends.¹ The Benedictines used thirteen MSS and four printed editions, and their text is good. It would have been safe to discard the bad spellings, however, and print *loquellas* (41) and *beluis* (43). Only a Dutchman can judge the translation adequately. The notes, which show commendable industry and intelligence, are a real help to the reader. Opinions will always vary as to what should be annotated and what left without comment. The present reviewer would have liked notes on *repugnantiae* (4), *negotatores in Africa* (4), *gratum habeo* (8), *nobilissimis* (§ 16, of Cicero's *Verrines*; is the word simply 'elative' or not?). The printing is untidy in places (pp. 31, 33, 39, 87, 189).

The following errors or omissions have been noticed: p. 26, 'Lexicographie' for 'Lexikographie', and 'altchristlichen' for 'altkirchlichen'; p. 79, 'accommodatis' for 'accommodatis'; p. 128, l. 17, 'XII' for 'XVII'; p. 148, 'Mohrman' for 'Mohrmann'; p. 167, 'Bennet' for 'Bennett'; p. 170, strange that the *Confessions* is not cited to explain Augustine's interest in birdlime; p. 172, add Tert. *Orat.* 15; p. 179 add *Raccolta di scritti in onore di Felice Ramorino*, p. 286; *Hermathena* XXIV pp. 20 f.; p. 185 add Rottmanner, *Geistesfrüchte aus der Klosterzelle* (reprint of article).

A. SOUTER.

Oxford.

¹ The Benedictine accidentally omits AUG. (p. 61, l. 4), but Wijdeveld rightly inserts it.

Jos. SCHRIJNEN und Christine MOHRMANN: *Studien sur Syntax der Briefe des hl. Cyprian*. 2 vols. Pp. xii+191; viii+159. Nijmegen: Dekker en van de Vegt, 1936-1937. Stiff paper, fl. 3.50 each.

READERS who are acquainted with the works of Watson (1896) and Bayard (1902) may wonder what necessity there was for this new work. A twofold answer may be given: the field covered is smaller, but the cultivation is more intense, and in the interval the psychological study of syntax has come into its own, and there have been issued studies of many other authors with whom Cyprian may profitably be compared. It cannot be too strongly insisted upon that, if Christian Latin authors are to be studied at all, Cyprian is the most worthy of them all, as he is an extremely careful writer, who on conversion did not forget what he had been taught in the rhetorical school, and his works had authority second only to Scripture in the Latin West. His letters have been re-edited quite recently by Bayard (*Saint Cyprien, Correspondance*, 2 vols, Paris, 1925) and his edition is known to Schrijnen and Mohrmann, though it is inadvertently omitted from their extensive and useful bibliographies.

This work forms part of the notable series 'Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva', which in learning will bear comparison with any other work of the kind. The volumes are clearly printed on strong paper, and pleasant to handle. The topics discussed in the present parts are, after a general introduction, clause-building, uses of nouns (including cases), adverbs, prepositional combinations with adverbial force, comparison of adjectives, pronouns, prepositions, use of verb-forms, and structure of clauses from every conceivable standpoint. The book ends with a summary and is adequately indexed.

The treatment is so characterized by learning and common sense that it would not be easy to dispute either its statements or its conclusions in general. Attention may, however, be called to some matters of detail. In the bibliography H. Koch's *Cyprian und der römische Primat* is mentioned, but not his more important *Cyprianische Untersuchungen* (1926), 'Gonzales' (p. ix) should be 'Gonzalez', 'Sjörgren' (p. xi) should be 'Sjögren'. The Dutch spelling 'tekst' constantly disfigures the otherwise almost unexceptionable German (cf. p. 95); 'Isaias' (p. 23) should be 'Esaías'; attention was first called to the impersonal *horret* (p. 29, II p. 3), I believe, by John E. B. Mayor in *C.R.* XI. 259; a more exact reference is desirable on p. 53 l. 3; 'Löfstedts' on p. 59 should be 'Löfstedts', and there the possibility that *populus* includes also the idea 'people of God' should be kept in view; on p. 65 Conway's notable treatment of *nos* in Cicero's letters deserved mention; p. 72, correct 'constituti'; p. 80, 'clipeum fidei' is scriptural (Eph. 6, 16); p. 105, read *solus* for *solas*; p. 110, it is absurd to talk of a very free paraphrase of the Bible where it is an exactly literal translation of the Septuagint; p. 129, the passage *si Abraham* etc. is biblical; p. 131, read *avri* for *avri*; *in uero* (p. 144) is already in Tert. *Apol.* 23 (Fuld.),

car. resurr. 11, 18, *adv. Iud.* 8, and later, in Hil. and Arnob., and on the same page *in nouum* is misunderstood (cf. Eph. 2, 15. 4, 24); *in peruersum* (p. 145) occurs as early as Manilius 2, 891; p. 158, eject the passage 13, 4, as it is a question of one of S's inferior readings; p. 167, read *Eleasaro* (not *Lazaro*); p. 175, read '99' after Ambrosiaster, not '90'; on II p. 10 for 'grace' read 'grâce'; p. 50, for 'Monro' read 'Munro'; p. 72, 'eine' (wrongly) accented.

Oxford.

A. SOUTER.

Edwin MAYSER: *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*. Band I: Laut- und Wortlehre. II. Teil: Flexionslehre. Pp. xv+215. Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1938. Paper.

THOSE who have followed with interest and admiration the progress of Mayser's work will learn with sincere regret, from the preface to the present instalment, of his death on the 4th-5th May last. He has thus not lived to see the second edition of vol. I completed; but it is good to know that his death does not mean that it will remain a fragment. The present part was ready for press when he died, and the remaining one was so far advanced that it can be brought out by Dr. Hans Widmann, whose work will consist in the main of no more than revising and digesting Mayser's materials.

As explained in the review of the previous part (*C.R.* L. 201), this new edition of vol. I is being issued in the reverse order to that of the original volume, beginning with the concluding section. The instalment under review is the second section of the volume (pp. 249-415 of the first edition). The expansion is not quite so great as in the case of part III, though more considerable than the number of pages would suggest, since the printing is closer. As before, the original section numbers (though not always those of the sub-sections) are retained, so that references to this edition can be utilized, for material common to both, by those who have only the first, and comparison of the two is easy. Mayser kept himself abreast of publication and research, and the material here included seems well up to date. There is an index of words, and it is therefore not necessary to await the first and concluding part in order to make full use of this instalment.

H. I. BELL.

British Museum.

Albert WIFSTRAND: *Aus der Papyrussammlung der Universitätsbibliothek in Lund*, I. II: Griechische Privatbriefe. *Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund*: 1934-5, II, and 1936-7, VI. Pp. 13 and 12; 1 plate and 2 plates. Lund: Gleerup. Paper.

IT is not clear whether these two parts are to be followed by others, but this is a natural assumption. The first, which has no sub-title and no serial number other than that of the *Bulletin* of which it forms a part, consists exclusively of literary papyri, seven in number; in the second are published five private letters.

The literary fragments are too imperfect to be of much interest. No. 1, *Iliad* Z, seems hardly worth publishing, as it contains no more than

ends and beginnings of lines, but it has a stichometrical note, B, not however against l. 200, where it should occur, but against l. 204. No. 2, from a second-century papyrus of Thucydides, twice agrees (only once on a matter of substance) with CG against the other MSS.; 3 is Isocrates, *Πρὸς Δημόνικον* (third century; once agrees with Urbinas against the others); 4 an unknown comedy (Menander?); 5 a Latin-Greek glossary (the Latin words in Greek characters, like P. Lond. 481; note *αικους* for *equus*); 6 medical recipes; 7 an anatomical catechism.

Of the letters the most noteworthy is no. 4, a third-century letter from a son to his mother, which contains some striking phrases, e.g. ἀπ[α]ξ καὶ δεύ[τε]ρον καὶ πολλάκι[ς] ἐγραψά σοι διὰ πολλῶν [ἀν]θρώπων ἵνα σε ἀναβῇ (sic) πρὸς ἐμέ καὶ προσκυνήσω σοι τὸ καλὸν σου πρόσωπον, and οὐδὲνα ἔχω εἰ μὴ σε τὴν γλυκυτότην μου μητέρα. After the first passage I would suggest reading, if possible, εἰ μὲν οὖν [βο]ύλη ἐλθε[ῖ]ν πρὸς ἐμέ <?ἐπί>στῖλον ὅτι 'καταλάβε με [ἐ]ν τῇ ἀναβέσει'; i.e. (in effect) 'send me word, "meet me on the way up."' For this use of καταλαμβάνω see P. Giss. 103, 8, 23. In any case ἀναβῆσι does not seem likely to mean, as the editor takes it, 'zur Zeit der Überschwemmung.' No. 4 is also of interest, and so too 1, a letter from a soldier to his brothers; the other two do not amount to much.

The editing is good, and the commentary is full but not extravagantly so, bringing out every point of interest. But it is a retrograde step to print the letters without accents, breathings or punctuation, and even without capitals for the proper names.

H. I. BELL.

British Museum.

Willy PEREMANS: *Vreemdelingen en Egyptenaren in Vroeg-Ptolemaïsch Egypte* (avec un résumé en français). Pp. xxx+313. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1937. Stiff paper, fr. 75.

THE aim of Dr. Peremans is to study some important problems of Egyptian history in the third century B.C.: the status of foreigners and Egyptians; their relations to one another; and the attitude of the government towards each group. Among foreigners, Macedonians and Greeks are sharply distinguished from Syrians, Arabs, and Jews. As a rule, the Egyptian name reveals the person's nationality, but *ξένος* usually denotes merely a stranger to the region or village in question.

The wide range of this work is evident from a summary of the headings—administration, police, and army (in dealing with the first two, P. gives from the papyri valuable lists of foreigners and Egyptians in each of the many posts); administrative abuses (with recently published examples, under the headings *ξένα, παρυσία, σταθμοί*); social and economic life; the nationality of the slaves (chiefly non-Egyptian); education; lawcourts and tribunals; religious worship. An answer is suggested to the question 'What was the fate of the Egyptian aristocracy of the fourth century?', and emphasis is laid upon the importance of the economic factor. The privileged position of

foreigners was primarily due to the king's desire to attract them to settle in Egypt, and there was no oppression of Egyptians as a conquered race. The influence of the priests was decisive in causing the national awakening of Egypt; yet of the priests the papyri tell us little or nothing. Obviously our documents are partial and incomplete: they are for the most part Greek papyri, belonging to centres more or less Hellenized, and very few are dated as early as the reign of Ptolemy Soter.

P.'s previous studies (here incorporated, with additions) have equipped him to deal authoritatively with this subject; but to support his view that the *Ἕλληνες* of P. Par. 66²² include non-Greeks of outstanding social rank and wealth, evidence from new papyri will be welcome.

W. G. WADDELL.

University of Egypt, Cairo.

Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. United States of America. The Robinson Collection, Baltimore, Md. Fasc. 2. By D. M. ROBINSON. Pp. 38; 51 monochrome and 4 coloured plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1937. Cloth and boards, \$5.

THIS fascicule contains red-figured vases of various shapes and sizes which are dated between 520 and 420 B.C. The descriptions are full: literature, attributions, and dates are given. The monochrome pictures are admirable and illustrate both the general aspect and the detail of the vases: the coloured plates are, as usual, unpleasant. Many interesting vases are worthily published, for instance Epictetus' reclining satyr, Phintias' boy shopping, Apollodorus' Hyacinthus on the swan, the Nicoxenus painter's amphora of Panathenaic shape, the Midas and Silenus by the painter of the Harrow oenochoe, and the scyphus by the Lewis painter, who must now because of his signature on this vase be called Polygnotus II. Little comment is necessary: add to the list of black-figured plates on p. 22 one in the Fitzwilliam Museum with a cock and one in Manchester with a cock and hen (*Manchester Memoirs*, lxxx, 42); pl. xliii, an interesting domestic scene, which I take to have some connection with the birth of the first child—the nurse giving the child to its mother in the presence of the father: compare a pyxis in Manchester (*Manchester Memoirs*, lxxvii, 6), where further figures are added—a woman with a thurible, Zeus, Aphrodite and a young man or god (Hymen?); pl. li, the simplest explanation of the sea scene would seem to be that it represents Peleus and Thetis.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

Volker NIEBERGALL: *Griechische Religion und Mythologie in der ältesten Literatur der Römer*. Pp. 47. Giessen: Druck der Limburger Vereinsdruckerei, 1937. Paper.

THIS is a carefully written and closely reasoned doctoral thesis, showing no great originality and arriving at no startling conclusions, but bearing evidence of an ability to analyse which ought to stand the author in good stead in the

future. That every Latin author from Livius Andronicus on is profoundly influenced by Greece is a commonplace which has sometimes stood in the way of observing the very different forms which that influence took as it was reacted to by men of various temperaments and earlier or later dates. Dr. Niebergall bases his research largely on a true and important principle, that the Romans contemporary with and influenced by Hellenistic Greece were themselves anything but Hellenistic in their attitude towards deity. Whereas to Menander or Callimachus religion was a debatable thing and the conventional gods hardly more real than they are to us, the Romans whom Livius Andronicus introduced to the Greek pantheon (Niebergall does not seem always to realize how much actual introduction was necessary; that, and not a desire for 'archaische Breite', is probably the reason for Livius insisting at greater length than Homer had done on the titles and relationships of the gods, p. 5) took Iuppiter or Mars very seriously, and the tone of the earlier poets accords with this. The change comes with Ennius and his dealings with sceptically-minded Greek originals, from Euripides to Euhemerus; see pp. 37 sqq.

One excellent point in the dissertation is the discussion (pp. 30 sqq.) of the *Amphitruo* of Plautus. Warde Fowler (*Religious Experience*, p. 352) makes this the very type of the degradation of Roman *numina* under Greek influence. Niebergall rightly points out that it does no such thing; Iuppiter and Alcmena are dignified, tragic figures, put side by side with such funny characters as Amphitruo and Sosia; the play is really *tragicomoedia* and as such un-Greek.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

A. ALFOLDI: *A Festival of Isis in Rome under the Christian Emperors of the IVth Century*. (Dissertationes Pannonicae ex Instituto Numismatico et Archaeologico Universitatis de Petro Pázmány Nominatae Budapestinensis Provenientes, Ser. II, Fasc. 7.) Pp. 95; 20 collotype plates; 1 text figure. Budapest: Institute of Numismatics and Archaeology of the Pázmány-University (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1937. Paper, Pengő 25 (bound, 28).

THIS monograph is a brilliant example of numismatics applied to history. Roman coins of the fourth century after Christ which bear types connected with Egyptian gods, and a reverse legend VOTA PVBLICA, used to be given carelessly to the Apostate's reign, for all the obvious difficulties. Álföldi's study of them, and his widely differing conclusions, throw much new light on the politico-religious history of the fourth century. The coins are of two classes, (i) 'imperial', i.e. with obv. showing an emperor's portrait ranging from Diocletian to Valentinian II, and (ii) 'anonymous', i.e. with obv. showing a bust of Isis or Serapis, or both. Álföldi proves by die-identities (*N.B.* Pl. XVII, 1 and 2 are not identities proper.—Cf. p. 22) that coins of class (i) often share an obv. die with coins struck, at Rome, for the normal series under various of the Emperors whose

busts are found; thus *Vota Publica* coins, made in Rome, and intended for distribution at the annual ceremony of Jan. 3rd (from 306 onwards), somehow connect with the Christian-Pagan struggles of the times. The 'anonymous' coins begin when the 'imperial' end, i.e. in 380 (A. puts Gratian's abdication as *pont. max.* in 378/9), and last until the pagan collapse in 395. Production, in these 'Christian' years, of pagan coins in a public factory represents, then, a last anti-Christian effort engineered by influential pagans, the more insidious because of the gradual fusion of the original ceremony of the imperial vows with that of the *Navigium Isidis*. The introduction of the 'imperial' series under Constantine is equally well proved: but the reason for it is still obscure. And recognition of Egyptian influence in the *Vota Publica* in the early second century (p. 49) may perhaps be exaggerated, as A. seems to appreciate (p. 55). But his essay is of immense value and interest: the catalogue is excellent; and the plates (not always clear: and Pl. XIII, last line, should read 35-44) show easily his analysis of linked dies and related types.

C. H. V. SUTHERLAND.

Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

L. DELAPORTE, É. DRIOTON, A. PIGANIOL, R. COHEN: *Atlas historique*. I. *L'Antiquité*. Pp. 20; xxx outline maps. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1937. Cardboard cover, 36 francs.

THIS collection of thirty original maps, with subsidiary plans, covers all periods of ancient history down to the third century of the Roman Empire, and all regions of classical and oriental culture, as far as the Indian conquests of Darius and Alexander. Within the severe limitations of the programme, it is most carefully and ingeniously executed. Only the most essential rivers and routes are indicated, and (in some maps only) the general trend of mountain ranges. A few maps have simple shading for 'spheres of influence' or successive expansions of territory. Main categories of sites are distinguished by differences of lettering, and where sites are thickly crowded, numerals refer to a key-list of names. There are detailed plans of Babylon, Assur, Thebes, Memphis, Carthage, Athens and Rome, and a convenient map of 'archaeological sites in Greece' gives the modern names from excavators' reports, with an indication of the character of the finds. Another gives the modern topography of the German *Limes*.

Prefixed is an excellent bibliography of general and special maps (by regions), with the principal books of reference and geographical articles in recent journals. Where so much is given, one must not cavil over omissions. There is naturally some difference of scale between the materials for the Near East, for example, and for Italy.

The names of the distinguished collaborators are sufficient guarantee for the wide learning and scholarly execution of a very useful book of reference, extraordinarily cheap considering the variety and quality of its contents.

Oxford.

JOHN. L. MYRES.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

(A reference to C.R. denotes a review or mention in the *Classical Review*.)

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(MARCH—JUNE, 1938. NOS. 13-26.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—C. Del Grande, *Intorno alle origini della tragedia ed altri saggi* [Naples, 1936. Pp. 141].—H. Moeller, *Untersuchungen zum Desmos des Aischylos* [C.R. LI. 169] (K. Ziegler). G. though interesting is too subjective in his judgments and in some respects out of date. M.'s work is valuable.—*Olympiodori in Platonis Gorgiam commentaria* ed. W. Norvin [C.R. LI. 204] (J. Pavlu). N., who previously edited (1913) O.'s commentary on the Phaedo, has now rendered scholarship a further important service.—W. P. Theunissen, *Ploutarchos' Leven van Aratos*. Met historisch-topographisch commentaar [Nijmegen, 1935. Pp. xx+327] (A. Kraemer). Text with Dutch translation. Full historical commentary and criticism of ancient and modern estimates of A.—H. G. Opitz, *Untersuchungen zur Uebertieferung der Schriften des Athanasius* [Berlin and Leipzig, 1935. Pp. x+216] (P. Heseler). Provides a new and much more solid basis for editing A.—*Plutarch's Moralia* with an English Translation by F. C. Babbitt. Vol. IV, V, X [C.R. LI. 17, LII. 66] (J. Schönemann). Careful text and good translation. Vol. X is mainly by H. N. Fowler.—*Plutarchi Vitae parallelae, Galba et Otho*, rec. K. Ziegler [C.R. LII. 66] (J. Schönemann). S. commends and discusses some readings.—T. B. L. Webster, *An Introduction to Sophocles* [C.R. L. 171] (P. Keseling). W. shows mastery of his material, cautious judgment and power of clear presentation. K. makes a few criticisms.—W. Ficker, *Vers und Satz im Dialog des Aischylos* [Leipzig, 1935. Pp. 75] (H. Färber). Well-arranged classification of cases where sentence-end and verse-end do not coincide.—H. F. Bouchery, *Themistius in Libanios' brieven* [C.R. LI. 240] (W. Stegemann). Contains much material and cannot be overlooked by students of the fourth century.—R. Böhme, *Das Prooimion, eine Form sakraler Dichtung der Griechen* [C.R. LII. 95] (F. Dornseiff). Stimulating, though D. disagrees with many of his views.—H. Bogner, *Platon im Unterricht*. Auf dem Wege zum nationalpolitischen Gymnasium. Heft I [Frankfurt, 1937. Pp. 39] (J. Pavlu). Rightly stresses the Apology.—W. Schneidewin, *Das sittliche Bewusstsein. Eine Gorgiasanalyse* [C.R. LII. 144] (J. Pavlu). Will be of assistance to teachers.

LATIN LITERATURE.—I. Rodriguez-Herrera, *Poeta christianus, Prudentius' Auffassung vom Wesen und von der Aufgabe des christlichen Dichters* [Speyer, 1936. Pp. 160] (M. Schuster). Very readable and instructive.—E. V. Mar-morale, *Petronio nel suo tempo* [C.R. LI. 232] (R. Helm). Refutes successfully though perhaps unnecessarily a recent theory that P. belongs to the third century.—B. Wijkström, *Studier över parafraser i latinsk prosa* [Göteborg, 1937. Pp. xvi+221] (W. Becher). Clear and instructive.—*Tacitus, The Annals* with an

English Translation by J. Jackson, Vol. III, IV (Lib. IV-XVI) [C.R. LI. 186] (A. Gudeman). The translation is a brilliant piece of writing but fails to reproduce Tacitean characteristics.—P. Boyancé, *Etudes sur le Songe de Scipion* (=Bibliothèque des Universités du Midi, fasc. XX) [Bordeaux-Paris, 1936. Pp. 192] (O. Seel). B. frequently fights with shadows but much of his detail is valuable.—T. Cutt, *Meter and diction in Catullus' hendecasyllabics* [C.R. LI. 202] (R. Helm). Careful and cautious study of the influence of metre on C.'s choice of words.—*Gaius, Institutiones*. 7. editionem curavit B. Kuebler [C.R. XLIX. 209] (H. Becher). An important advance on the earlier editions.—*Etudes horatiennes*. Travaux de la Faculté de Phil. et Lettres de l'Université de Bruxelles, VII [Brussels, 1937. Pp. vii+265] (R. Helm). H. summarizes many essays.—B. Biliński, *De Calone Sili in Italiae descriptione uno solo fonte* [C.R. LII. 41] (A. Klotz). B. fails to prove his contention.—*Remains of Old Latin*, newly edited and translated by E. H. Warmington. I. *Ennius and Caelius* [C.R. XLIX. 188] (A. Klotz). Stimulating and instructive though some details as regards Ennius are open to criticism.—O. Autore, *Marziale e l'epigramma greco* [C.R. LII. 40] (R. Helm). Careful attempt to estimate the degree of M.'s originality.—L. A. Constans, *Cicéron, Correspondance III* [C.R. LI. 134] (R. Philippson). Maintains the high standard of the previous vols.—P. I. Enk, *Handboek der Latijnse Letterkunde II 1, 2* [C.R. LII. 128] (R. Helm). An excellent treatment of the early period in general and of Plautus in particular.

HISTORY.—K. I. Gelzer, *Die Schrift vom Staate der Athener* [C.R. LII. 27] (E. Kalinka). G. handles the problems courageously, but his solutions are not convincing.—G. Rohde, *Die Kultsätze der römischen Pontifices* [Religionsgeschichtl. Versuche u. Vorarbeiten, XXV. Berlin, 1936] (E. Marbach). There is much that is new and convincing in this valuable work.—G. H. Macurdy, *Vassal Queens and Some Contemporary Women in the Roman Empire* [C.R. LI. 159] (T. Lenschau). Scholarly treatment of a subject which generally receives too scant attention.—Altertumskundl. Fachabt. der Univ. Königsberg i. Pr., *Die Geschichte und Lebensordnung Spartas* [Königsberg, 1937. Pp. 84] (T. Lenschau). An informative series of lectures and discussions on practically all sides of Spartan life.—A. v. Premerstein, *Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats* [C.R. LII. 35] (E. Hohl). A timely example of sound scientific method.—P. Cloché, *Démosthène et la fin de la démocratie athénienne* [C.R. LI. 177] (C. Rüger). R. praises C.'s mastery of his material, cautious judgment and clear exposition, and gives a summary of each chapter.—B. Pace, *Arte e Civiltà della Sicilia antica*. Vol. I [C.R. LI. 128] (E. Ziebarth). Favourable review with summary.—P. Lambrechts, *La composition du sénat romain de l'accession au trône d'Hadrien à la mort de Commode* (117-192)

[Rijksuniversiteit te Gent, Werken uitgegeven door de Faculteit van de Wijsbegeerte en Letteren, 79^e Aflevering. Antwerp, 1936. Pp. 234] (E. Hohl). Strikingly successful investigation.—H. Berve, *Miltiades* [C.R. LI. 235] (T. Lenschau). Many new suggestions which deserve consideration.

PAPYROLOGY.—*Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection. Miscellaneous Papyri* (= *Michigan Papyri*, Vol. III). Ed. J. H. Winter [C.R. LI. 240] (K. Fr. W. Schmidt). Many new texts carefully edited.—*Papyri in the Princeton University Collections*, II. Ed. with notes by E. H. Kase [C.R. LII. 85] (K. Fr. W. Schmidt). Ninety-two texts dating from Ptolemaic to Byzantine period without translation but with careful introduction and remarks.—F. Zimmermann, *Griechische Romanpapyri und verwandte Texte* [Heidelberg, 1936. Pp. 114] (B. A. Müller). An exemplary edition with mainly linguistic commentary and indices.—*ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΣ ΠΑΤΑΟΤ*. Nach dem Papyrus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek hrsg. von C. Schmidt [C.R. LI. 85] (P. Thomsen). Very important piece of work excellently performed.

ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANTIQUITIES.—R. Naumann, *Der Quellbezirk von Nîmes* (Denkmäler antiker Architektur, Bd. IV. Hrsg. vom Archäologischen Institut des Deutschen Reiches) [Berlin and Leipzig, 1937. Pp. vii+61 with many illustrations] (C. Weickert). Excellent description, explanation and illustration.—*Berytus*. Archaeological Studies published by the Museum of Archaeology of the American University of Beirut. Vol. III, Fasc. 1 [Copenhagen, 1936. Pp. 128] (P. Thomsen). Five articles summarized by T.—L. Deubner, *Kult und Spiele im alten Olympia* [Leipzig, 1936. Pp. 32] (J. Göhler). Excellent except when he discusses the origin of the games.—*Eleusis*. A guide to the excavations and the museum by K. Kouroniotes, translated from the Greek by O. Broneer [Athens, 1936. Pp. 127, with 71 illustrations and a plan] (J. Sieveking). Very serviceable.

PHILOSOPHY.—E. de Strijcker, *Themistios getuigenis over de exoterische en akroamatische werken van Aristoteles* [Kath. Univ. Leuven, Philolog. Stud. VII, pp. 100-121]—*Antisthène ou Thémistios* [Archives de Philosophie XII, 3, pp. 181-206] (W. Stegemann). S. approves of Str.'s condemnation of the theory that makes Them. dependent on Ant.

NEW TESTAMENT.—P. Feine, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Achte, völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage von J. Behm [Leipzig, 1936] (P. Thomsen). Brings F.'s work accurately up to date.—G. Hartmann, *Der Aufbau des Markus-evangeliums mit einem Anhang: Untersuchungen zur Echtheit des Markusschlusses* (= *Neutestament. Abh.* XVII 2-3) [Münster, 1936. Pp. xv+276] (P. Thomsen). Many important remarks though the main thesis is doubtful.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Mizraim, Journal of Papyrology, Egyptology, History of Ancient Laws, and their relations to the Civilizations of Bible Lands*. I, II [Stechert and Co., New York] Fr. W. Frhr. von Bissing). Important articles by the editor N. J. Reich, by Bell, Albright,

Kenyon and others.—*Philological studies in honor of Walter Miller* (University of Missouri Studies XI, 3, 1) [C.R. LI. 48] (A. Klotz). 9 essays mainly on classical subjects.—A. Erman, *Die Welt am Nil. Bilder aus dem alten Aegypten*. [Leipzig, 1936. Pp. xvi+235] (G. Michael). An excellent book which gives in popular form the results of the life-work of the Nestor of German Egyptology.—G. Radke, *Die Bedeutung der weissen und schwarzen Farbe in Kult und Brauch der Griechen und Römer* [Jena, 1936. Pp. 79] (C. Blümlein). Good collection of material.—*The Annual of the British School at Athens*, XXXIV (G. Lippold). Two important articles on ceramics by R. M. Cook and E. A. Lane.—C. W. L. Scheurleer, *Griekische Ceramiek* [Rotterdam, 1936. Pp. v+208] (G. Lippold). Fulfills its purpose in giving general review of the whole field.—*Commentationes Vindobonenses*, II [C.R. LI. 46] (A. Klotz). 6 articles, which K. summarizes.—A. C. Chatzis, *Ἑλλάς—Ἑλλάς—Ἑλλάς* [Wissenschaftl. Jahrb. der philos. Fak. der Univ. Athen 1935/1936, pp. 128-161] (A. Soyter). Ingenious but in part hypothetical.—*Der Neue Brockhaus*, Altbuch in 4 Bänden und einem Atlas. Band II [Leipzig, 1937] (F. T. Poland). As trustworthy as Vol. I.—*Unsterbliches Hellas*, hrsg. von C. Kriekoukis u. K. Bömer [Berlin, 1938. Pp. 272 with 172 illustrations] (G. Soyter). A series of essays, excellently illustrated, on ancient and modern Greece.—*Studi Etruschi*, Vol. VIII-X [Florence, 1934-36] (Fr. W. Frhr. v. Bissing). Many important archaeological and linguistic articles.—*Die bildende Kunst in Oesterreich* hrsg. von K. Ginhart [Baden bei Wien, 1936. Pp. 192 with many illustrations] (E. Gerster). 11 essays dealing with the art, archaeology and ethnology of the area down to A.D. 600.—*Bibliotheca philologica classica*. Beiblatt zum Jahresber. über die Fortschritte der Klass. Altertumswiss. Bd. 62, 1935. Bearbeitet v. W. Abel u. G. Reincke [Leipzig, 1937. Pp. x+282] (H. Ranft). Deserves the gratitude of all classical specialists.—W. Willrich, *Säuberung des Kunsttempels* [Munich, 1937. Pp. 178 with 64 illustrations].—E. Hundeiker, *Rasse, Volk, Soldatentum* [Munich, 1937. Pp. 62 with 37 illustrations] (H. Philipp). W. discusses the features that make Greek art still important for us. H. makes important suggestions about race and the warrior-spirit, but his conclusions would require the support of historians.—W. Jaeger, *Humanistische Reden und Vorträge* [Berlin and Leipzig, 1937. Pp. vi+217] (R. Meister). Important for relation between classical studies and contemporary culture.—E. Dutoit, *Le Thème de l'Adynaton dans la Poésie antique* [Paris, 1936] (M. Schmidt). Carefully arranged examples of this type of expression from Greek and Latin poetry.—W. Brandenstein, *Die Herkunft der Etrusker* [Der Alte Orient 35, 1. Leipzig, 1937. Pp. 41] (K. Olzscha). B. is convincing on the question of Lydian origin although his handling of some further problems is open to criticism.—O. Waser, *Neuer Führer durch die Archäologische Sammlung der Universität Zürich*. II. Teil: Modelle, Abgüsse u. Nachbildungen von Werken griechischer u. römischer Kunst [Zürich, 1937]

(G. Lippold). Very useful though some details should be corrected.

COMMUNICATIONS.—March 26, A. Giusti, *Omero e il Vangelo* (2 pp.).—April 2, H. Lucas, *Das Urbild des plautinischen Rudens* (1 col.).—April 16, L. Weber, *Lectiones Herodoteae* II (3 cols.).—April 23, R. Rau, *Zur Deutung der sog. Pasquinogruppe* (1 col.).—April 30, C. Fries, *Dichter-Legende* ($\frac{1}{2}$ col.).—May 14, H. Markowski, *Zu Antipater von Tarsos* (1 col.).—May 21, C. Fries, *Zu Arrians Anabasis Alexandri* ($\frac{1}{2}$ cols.).—May 28, A. Olivieri, *Medicinalia Magica* (3 cols.).—June 11, R. Hanslik, *Zu Horas Od. I 7* (1 p.).—June 18, R. G. Bury, *Lucretiana* (3 cols.).—June 25, H. Markowski, *Zu Athenodoros von Tarsos, Sandons Sohn* (3 cols.).

GNOMON.

XIV. 4. APRIL, 1938.

E. Meyer: *Geschichte des Altertums*. Vol. 3: *Der Ausgang der altorientalischen Geschichte und der Aufstieg des Abendlands bis zu den Perserkriegen*. Second edition by H. E. Stier [Stuttgart: Cotta, 1937. Pp. xix+787] (Meyer). Neither reprint nor true revision. M. hopes that succeeding volumes will be more satisfactory. B. Förtsch: *Die politische Rolle der Frau in der römischen Republik* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1935. Pp. 126] (Strasburger). A difficult subject receives an able treatment which has great value, however much doubt may be felt about much of the detail. K. Hönn: *Augustus* [Vienna: Seidel, 1937. Pp. 272, 56 plates] (Volkmann). H. often contradicts himself and makes many false deductions. H. M. D. Parker: *A history of the Roman world from A.D. 138 to 337* [C.R. L. 194] (Vittinghoff). The biographical arrangement is unfortunate, but the book is full of information; V. disagrees with some of the conclusions. A. Grabar: *L'empereur dans l'art byzantin* [Paris: Belles Lettres, 1936. Pp. viii+296, 40 plates] (Dölger). It is impossible to praise G.'s book too highly. K. Voigt: *Staat und Kirche von Konstantin dem Grossen bis zum Ende der Karolingerzeit* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936. Pp. x+460] (Ensslin). V. does not fulfil all E.'s wishes, but the book has certain positive merits. D. Mahnke: *Unendliche Sphäre und Allmittelpunkt* [Halle: Niemeyer, 1937. Pp. viii+252] (Speiser). Valuable work on a subject which, though obscure to most classical scholars, is important for the understanding of ancient philosophy. W. Hüttl: *Antoninus Pius* [C.R. L. 196] (Wickert). Neither a biography nor an original survey of the history of the period; but will be useful to those who undertake such tasks. K. Jax: *Der Frauentypus der römischen Dichtung* [Innsbruck/Leipzig: Rauch, 1937. Pp. 71] (Kroll). A supplement to J.'s earlier book about the Greeks; but the material is less satisfactory and the treatment less competent. A. Weirich: *Histoire d'une vieille demeure à l'époque gallo-romaine* [Strasbourg: Port autonome de Strasb., 1936. Pp. 73, 19 plates] (Koethe). Interesting and well-informed. Excellent illustrations give a good idea of Roman ceramics of the time and district. V. Nieber-

gall: *Griechische Religion und Mythologie in der ältesten Literatur der Römer* [C.R. L. 150] (Rose). Useful and on the whole persuasive. S. Agrell: *Die pergamenische Zauberscheibe und das Tarockspiel* [C.R. L. 42] (Dornseiff). A.'s interpretations are illuminating and for the most part convincing.—Bibliographical Supplement 1938 nr. 2 (down to March 31).

XIV. 5. MAY, 1938.

O. Waldhauer: *Die antiken Skulpturen der Ermitage*, Part 3 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1936. Pp. 84, 44 plates 4°] (Brendel). This good catalogue will be a lasting tribute to its author. Some of the problems are controversial and cannot be considered solved. E. Fiechter: (1) *Das Theater in Megalopolis* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1931. Pp. 30, 23 illustrations, 6 plates 4°]; (2) *Das Dionysos-Theater in Athen*. Vol. 1: *Die Ruine*; vol. 3: *Einzelheiten und Baugeschichte* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1935-6. Pp. 93, 12 plates, 82 illustrations; pp. 92, 25 plates, 96 illustrations] (v. Gerkan). G. criticizes in detail and finds much cause for disagreement, but admits that each book will be useful. G. Daux: *Pausanias à Delphes* [Paris: Piccard, 1936. Pp. 207, 8 plates] (Schober). Many of D.'s observations are sound, but they show that Pausanias wrote for readers, not, as D. thinks, for travellers. H. Thiersch: *Ependytes und Ephod* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936. Pp. xii+225, 54 plates] (Schmökel). Important both for archaeologists and for historians of religion, though not free from faults. C. Koch: *Der römische Suppiter* [Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1937. Pp. 136] (Rose). Interesting but not always convincing. R. briefly states his own views. W. F. Jackson Knight: *Cumaean Gates* [C.R. L. 182] (Seel). An amazing collection of rarely accessible material; but the argument often lacks care and precision. H. Lindemann: *Die Sonderngötter in der Apologetik der Civitas Dei Augustini* [C.R. XLV. 91] (Bickel). An important contribution to the subject. (1) C. Bonner: *A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas with a fragment of the Mandates* [C.R. XLVIII. 199]; (2) Åke V. Ström: *Der Hirt des Hermas. Allegorie oder Wirklichkeit?* [Uppsala, 1936. Pp. 45] (Nock). (1) An excellent edition; all students of late Greek should read it. (2) Re-opens two old and perhaps insoluble questions, but the discussions are good. J. Svennung: *Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Lautlehre* [C.R. L. 141] (Niedermann). N. has a very favourable impression though he rejects many of the conclusions. E. Hansen: *Die Stellung der Affektrede in den Tragödien des Seneca* [Diss. Berlin, 1934. Pp. 82] (Friedrich). An interesting appreciation of Seneca's literary development which leads to useful practical results. H. Linde: *Studier till Columellas nionde bok* [Diss. Göteborg, 1936. Pp. viii+83] (Kleberg). Contains much information and improves the text. H. Zilliaceus: *De elocutione Marci Aurelii imperatoris quaestiones syntacticae* [C.R. L. 201] (Castiglioni). Diligent, but serves no very useful purpose and sometimes lacks precision. Tertulliano: *De Pallio*. Introduction, text and

Italian translation by G. Marra [Naples: Morano, 1937. Pp. 120] (Souter). Differs completely from M.'s edition of 1932 and will be particularly useful to less advanced students. L. Zancan: *Le cause della terza guerra punica* [Venice: Ferrari, 1936. Pp. 73] (Hohl). A prudent and acute study. Ph. N. Oikonomos: *ΟΔΥΣΣΕΩΣ ΝΟΣΤΟΣ* [Athens, 1937. Pp. 49, 18 illustrations] (Goessler). G. entirely disagrees with Oik., who is neither philologist nor archaeologist. H. G. Strebel: *Wertung und Wirkung des thukydideischen Geschichtswerkes in der griechisch-römischen Literatur* [Diss. Munich, 1935. Pp. 95] (Momigliano). Useful, but slight, with a defective bibliography. H. Gaebler: *Fälschungen makedonischer Münzen*, 3 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1936. Pp. 16, 4 plates 4° (SBBerl. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1936, 31)] (Küthmann). K. finds most of G.'s judgments convincing.

XIV. 6. JUNE, 1938.

Der römische Limes in Österreich, 1-18 [Vienna and Leipzig: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1900-1937. 4°] (Fabricius). Many interesting problems are raised by this fruitful work; it is to be hoped that it will soon be continued. J. E. Powell: *A Lexicon to Herodotus* [C.R. LI. 96] (Radermacher). A very instructive and well-produced book for which scholars must be grateful. R. Blum: *La composizione dello scritto ippocrateo περί διαιτης ὁρίων* [Rome: Bardi, 1936. Pp. 46 (R. Acc. Naz. dei Lincei, Rendiconti Ser. VI, vol. XII, fasc. 1-2)] (Diller). Competent. D. discusses in some detail. Héloïdore: *Les Éthiopiennes*, vol. 1. Edited by R. M. Rattenbury and T. W. Lumb; translated by J. Maillon [C.R. L. 65] (Castiglioni). Important in that the text is for the first time founded on a full examination of the MS. tradition. C. questions some points of principle and detail. L. Deubner: (1) *Iamblichi de vita Pythagorica liber* [C.R. LI. 68]; (2) *Bemerkungen zum Text der Vita Pythagorae des Iamblichus* [SBBerl. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1935, 19. Pp. 612-90, 824-7] (Theiler). D.'s work has resulted in a sound edition with useful citations of parallel passages. *Olympiodori philosophi in Platonis Gorgiam commentaria* ed. W. Norvin [C.R. LI. 204] (Beutler). An uncritical and disappointing edition. *Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones* ed. R. A. B. Mynors [C.R. LI. 188] (Bickel). A notable book which, though it might have been better in some respects, greatly advances knowledge. *Papers presented to Sir Henry Stuart Jones* [JRS 27 (1937), part 1. Pp. 151, 20 plates and a portrait] (Gelzer). The papers are a worthy contribution to Roman studies. *Bibliotheca philologica classica* vol. 62 (1935). Ed. W. Abel and G. Reincke [Leipzig: Reisland, 1937. Pp. viii + 282] (Geissler). There are mistakes, but all in all it conforms to the highest standard of the series. Vl. Georgiev: *Die Träger der kretisch-mykenischen Kultur, ihre Herkunft und ihre Sprache*. Vol. 1: *Urgriechen und Urillyrier* [Sofia: Imprimerie de la Cour, 1937. Pp. 203] (Specht). The argument is unconvincing, but the book may be recommended as a stimulant. H. Lorenz: *Untersuchung zum Prætorium* [Diss. Halle, 1936. Pp. 119] (Schleiermacher). The ob-

servations made on the available material are sound and useful, but the material is incomplete. L. Wenger: *Istituzione di procedura civile Romana* [Milan: Giuffrè, 1938. Pp. xix + 376] (Hellebrand). This revised edition of a book originally written in German is of great value. E. Ziebarth: *Eine Handelsrede aus der Zeit des Demosthenes* [C.R. LI. 84] (Passerini). A good way of grappling with the problems of Greek economics. P. only finds minor causes for complaint.—Bibliographical Supplement 1938 Nr 3 (down to May 31).

XIV. 7. JULY, 1938.

Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Diritto Romano (Bologna e Roma, 1933). Bologna, vol. I (1934, pp. lxxx + 518), vol. II (1935, pp. 476); Roma, vol. I (1934, pp. xlviii + 558), vol. II (1935, pp. 666). [Pavia: Fusi] (Kreller). K. classifies and describes the results of a very important congress. C. A. Maschi: *Disertiones. Ricerche intorno alla divisibilità del consortium nel diritto romano antico* [Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1935. Pp. 59] (Wieacker). M.'s care and scholarship are admirable, but his success is limited by the trackless nature of the thicket which he is exploring. E. Vetter: *Etruskische Wortdeutungen*. Part I: *Die Agramer Mumienbinde* [Vienna: Steckler, 1937. Pp. 78] (Olzsha). O. accepts V.'s theory that the fragment represents a ritual calendar, but does not think that he has proved that Etruscan is a pure Indo-European language. W. J. W. Koster: *Traité de métrique grecque suivi d'un précis de métrique latine* [C.R. LI. 79] (Rupprecht). K. unfortunately does not take into account the most modern developments, but as far as it goes his work is clear and useful. R. discusses some points of detail. F. Hampl: *Die griechischen Staatsverträge des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Christi Geb.* [C.R. LI. 139] (Wüst). Often suggestive though inconclusive. Some parts raise grave doubts. 1. *Steuerlisten römischer Zeit aus Theadelphia*. Ed. H. Korstenbeutel [Berlin: Weidmann, 1937. Pp. ix + 268, 4 plates 4°]; 2. *Tax rolls from Karamis in two volumes*. Part 1: *Text*. Ed. H. C. Youtie [C.R. LI. 240] (Zucker). 1. Z. describes the contents of the papyri and comments at length. 2. Interesting documents; the commentary will be awaited with interest. E. Peterich: *Kleine Mythologie* [Frankfurt: Societätsverlag, 1937. Pp. xi + 160, 16 plates] (Camerer). Elementary, but useful to those for whom it is designed. M. Grabmann: *Mittelalterliche Deutung und Umbildung der aristotelischen Lehre vom Noûs νοῦς nach einer Zusammenstellung im Cod. III 22 der Universitätsbibliothek Basel* [Munich: Beck, 1936. Pp. 106 (SBMünch. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1936, 4)] (Hoffman). An important contribution to our knowledge of the reception of Aristotle and his commentators in the 14th century. K. Reich: *Kant und die Ethik der Griechen* [Tübingen: Mohr, 1935. Pp. 48] (Gadamer). This able study is based on a good knowledge and understanding of Kant. Ks. F. Sokolowski: *Kult Dionysos in Delphos* [Lwow: Nakl. Nauk, 1936. Pp. 86, 1 plate (French summary pp. 71-86)] (Nilsson). N. disagrees with S.'s explanation of the origins, but approves of his account of the growth of the cult after the middle of

the 4th century B.C. P. Ducati: *Le problème étrusque*. Translated by M. Paque [C.R. LII. 47] (Szabó). An excellent survey of what has been written about the origins and the language of the Etruscans, but other and more important problems are ignored. C. Lanzani: *Lucio Cornelio Silla Dittatore* [C.R. L. 193] (Ensslin). A well-documented but unconvincing apology for Sulla. B. E. Perry: *Studies in the text history of the life and fables of Aesop* [C.R. LI. 147] (Zeitzi). P. displays great learning and industry. Most important is his description of a newly discovered manuscript. Z. awaits P.'s promised edition with interest.

CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

VOL. XXXI, Nos. 18-25. MARCH-MAY, 1938.

(21) W. A. Oldfather, *Socrates in Court*. In agreement with H. Gomperz (*Wiener Studien*, 1936, 32-43), O. argues that Socrates made no speech in his own defence, but was laughed or shouted down after saying a few words.

(24) *In Conclusion* (Editorial). C. J. Kraemer, Jr., Editor, announces resignation.

REVIEWS.—(18) *Cambridge Ancient History* XI [C.R. LI. 75] (E. L. Hettich). Rüter, *Zeit und Heimat der homerischen Epen* [pp. 293. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1937] (G. E. Duckworth). Influenced by Dörpfeld and Mahlow R. seeks unconvincingly to establish Kerngedichte in 12th century expanded by Homer in 9th. Flacelière, *Les Aitolians à Delphes* [pp. 564. Paris: de Boccard, 1937] (J. V. Fine). Masterly; should be read by all students of the Hellenistic period. Steche, *Altgermanien im Erdkunde des Claudius Ptolemaeus* [pp. 192. Leipzig: Kabitzsch, 1937] (W. W. Hyde). A useful study and favourable estimate of P. on prehistoric Germany. Gaebler, *Die antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands III* [pp. 234, 40 pls. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1935] (P. Clement). Convenient and useful account—save for section on forgeries—of Macedonian coinages.

(19) Barnes, *An Intellectual and Cultural History of the Western World* [pp. 1250. New York: Random House, 1937] (W. C. McDermott). Too many errors in the classical section. Béguignon, *La Vallée du Spercheios* [pp. 398. Paris: de Boccard, 1937] (H. D. Hansen). Excellent and much-needed study of the history and topography of a little-known region. Galpin, *The Music of the Sumerians* [pp. 110. Cambridge University Press, 1937] (C. Sachs). Somewhat optimistic work on an extraordinarily difficult subject. Hanfmann, *Altetruskische Plastik* [C.R. LI. 203] (Å. Åkerström). Will be very useful in reopening discussion on Etruscan art. *Inscriptiones Italiae* XI, XI, 1 [C.R. XLVII. 186] (M. L. W. Laistner). Well produced; contents not exciting. Wright, *Marcus Agrippa* [C.R. LI. 194] (R. P. Johnson). Well written but inferior to Reinhold's book in accuracy and interest—even for the general reader. Woodward, *Perseus* [C.R. LI. 246] (D. F. Brown). Praised as a type of work likely to revive popular interest in the classics.

(20) Harvey, *The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature* [C.R. LI. 246] (E. F.

D'Arms). Valuable for the layman, but based on obsolescent handbooks. de Francisci, *Storia del diritto romano III*, 1 [pp. 332. Milan: Giuffrè, 1936] (C. Pharr). Brilliantly written study of the historical and legal development from 235 to 555 A.D. Noe, *A Bibliography of Greek Coin Hoards* [pp. 362. New York: The American Numismatic Society, 1937] (R. A. Pack). Second edition enlarged chiefly by accounts of 270 more hoards.

(21) Koestermann, *P. Cornelii Taciti libri qui supersunt I ii, II ii* [C.R. LI. 149] (H. J. Leon). Will be the best available text for some years. Bengtson, *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit I* [pp. 235. Munich: Beck, 1937] (C. B. Welles). Thorough, and mostly sound, study of the title *strategos* in the Macedonian and Hellenistic kingdoms. Colson, *Philos VII* [C.R. LII. 146] (R. Marcus). Praised.

(22) Kortenbeutel, *Steuerlisten römischer Zeit aus Theadelphia* [pp. 268, 4 pls. Berlin: Weidmann, 1937] (N. Lewis). Publication, marred by numerous errors, of primarily fiscal papyri. Sachs, *World History of the Dance* [pp. 469, 32 pls. New York: Norton, 1937] (L. B. Lawler). Idiomatic translation; unsatisfying account of dances of classical antiquity. Pallottino, *Elementi di Lingua Etrusca* [pp. 109. Florence: Rinascimento del Libro, 1936] (G. M. A. Hanfmann). An admirable reference book. Löwy, *Zur Datierung attischer Inschriften* [pp. 30. Vienna: Hölder, 1937] (B. L. Trell). Unconvincing case for later dating of some early Attic inscriptions.

(23) Herrmann, *Querolus* [C.R. LII. 134] (K. M. Abbott). Unfavourably criticized in detail. Cooper, *Plato, Phaedrus etc.* [pp. lviii, 436. Oxford University Press, 1938] (R. K. Hack). Valuable and delightful. Cumont, *L'Égypte des Astrologues* [C.R. LII. 34] (S. L. Wallace). Lucid and generally excellent. Marcus, *Josephus*, vol. VI [C.R. LII. 84] (G. M. Harper). Favourable. Seel, *Römischer Denker und römischer Staat* [C.R. LII. 48] (C. L. Sherman). Tendentious but scholarly. Bonner, *The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek* [C.R. LII. 84] (N. Lewis). Exemplary edition of a new text. *Lateinischer Sprachunterricht* [pp. 84. Leipzig: Teubner, 1936] (P. S. Miller). Various authors on a new humanistic spirit in modern German classical training.

(24) Blegen, *Prosymna* [C.R. LI. 246] (A. D. Fraser). Sound but over-lengthy report of not very interesting excavations near the Argive Heraeum. von Premerstein, *Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats* [C.R. LII. 35] (D. McFadyen). A new interpretation open to fatal objections. Gauss, *Plato's Conception of Philosophy* [pp. 272. New York: Macmillan, 1937] (G. M. A. Grube). Gauss is too much inclined to attribute his own ideas to Plato. Witt, *Albinus and the History of Middle Platonism* [C.R. LII. 17] (C. Murley). Sound and scholarly, but suffers from condensation.

Every number contains 'Recent Publications' and (save 21) 'Abstracts of Articles'. 'In the Classroom' appears in 18, 20, 22, 24; 'Classical News' in 22, and 'Shorter Notices' in 23.

No. 25 contains indices only.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- Adler (A.)** Suidae Lexicon. Edidit A. A. Pars V praefationem indices dissertationem continens. Pp. iv + 280. (Lexicographi Graeci, vol. I.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1938. Export prices: paper, RM. 13.50; bound, 15.
- Allais (Y.)** Djemila. Pp. 83; 12 plates, 1 plan. (Le Monde Romain.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1938. Paper, 20 fr.
- Allard Pierson Stichting**, Universiteit van Amsterdam. Archaeologisch-historische Bijdragen. V. Götter und Kulte im ptolemäischen Alexandrien, von E. Visser. Pp. 131. VI. Aeneas' Arrival in Latium: Observations on legends, history, religion, topography and related subjects in Vergil, Aeneid VII, 1-135, by H. Boas. Pp. 260; 1 plate. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Mij., 1938.
- Alpha Classics.** (1) Caesar's Invasions of Britain; (2) Cicero's Speeches for Marcellus and Ligarius; (3) Euripides' Hecuba; (4) Livy, Book V; (5) Vergil's Aeneid III; (6) Vergil's Aeneid IX; (7) Xenophon's Anabasis II. Edited by (1) R. C. Carrington (2) J. Paterson, (3) F. W. King, (4) J. E. Pickstone, (5) R. W. Moore, (6) B. Tilly, (7) R. E. Snaith. Pp. xi + 118, viii + 144, viii + 162, viii + 196, xi + 105, viii + 109, viii + 134; illustrations. London: Bell, 1938. Cloth, (1, 2, 4-7) 2s. each, (3) 2s. 6d.
- Amato (G. P.)** M. Tullii Ciceronis oratio prima—secunda—tertia—quarta in Catilinam. Introduzione e commento di G. P. A. 4 vols. Pp. 43, 47, 49, 49. Turin: Lattes, 1938. Paper, L. 3, 3, 3, 3.50.
- Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology.** Issued by the Institute of Archaeology. Vol. XXV. Nos. 1-2. Pp. 66; 17 plates. Liverpool: University Press, 1938. Paper, 12s.
- Austin (R. P.)** The Stoichedon Style in Greek Inscriptions. Pp. xii + 130; 14 plates. (Oxford Classical and Philosophical Monographs.) London: Milford, 1938. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Ax (W.)** M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta . . . Fasc. 46: De divinatione, De fato, Timaeus. Ottonis Plasberg schedis usus recognovit W. Ax. Pp. xiv + 214. Leipzig: Teubner, 1938. Export prices: paper, RM. 4.20; bound, 4.80.
- Baron (H.)** Cicero and the Roman Civic Spirit in the Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance. Pp. 28. (Reprinted from the 'Bulletin of the John Rylands Library', Vol. 22, No. 1.) Manchester: University Press, 1938. Paper.
- Bends (G.)** Die Echtheitsfrage des vierten Buches der frontinischen Strategemata. Pp. xv + 272. (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N.F. Afd. 1. Bd 34. Nr 4.) Lund: Gleerup (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1938. Paper, kr. 8.
- Bequignon (Y.), Bidez (J.), Demargne (P.), Flacelière (R.), de La Coste-Messelière (P.), Picard (C.)** Etudes d'Archéologie grecque. Pp. xii + 159; illustrations. Ghent: Ecole des Hautes Etudes, 1938. Paper, 40 frs. belges.
- Bibliotheca philologica classica.** Band 63 (1936). Bearbeitet von W. Abel und G. Reincke. Pp. x + 204. (Beiblatt zum Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte d. klass. Altertumswissenschaft. Jahrg. 62.) Leipzig: Reisland, 1938. Paper, M. 15.
- Bidez (J.) et Drachmann (A. B.)** Emploi des signes critiques, disposition de l'apparat, dans les éditions savantes de textes grecs et latins. Edition nouvelle par A. Delatte et A. Severyns. Pp. 50. Brussels: Union Académique Internationale; Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1938. Paper.
- Bieler (F. A.)** The Syntax of the Cases and Prepositions in Cassiodorus' Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita. Pp. xxi + 220. (The Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin, Vol. VI.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1938. Paper, \$2.
- Bikerman (F.)** Institutions des Séleucides. Pp. 268. (Haut-Commissariat de la République Française en Syrie et au Liban—Service des Antiquités—Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique, Tome XXVI.) Paris: Geuthner, 1938. Paper, 120 fr.
- Blackwell's Byzantine Hand List.** A catalogue of Byzantine authors and books on Byzantine literature, history, religion, art, archaeology, etc. Pp. vii + 68. Oxford: Blackwell. Cloth, 2s. 6d. (interleaved, 3s. 6d.).
- Bonner (R. J.) and Smith (G.)** The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle. Vol. II. Pp. vii + 320. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1938. Cloth, 16s.
- Boyajian (Z. C.)** In Greece with Pen and Palette. Pp. xiii + 205; 16 three-colour photogravures, 2 maps. London: Dent, 1938. Cloth, 15s.
- Bréhier (E.)** Plotin. Ennéades. VI. 2. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1938. Paper, 40 fr.
- Cadoux (C. J.)** Ancient Smyrna. A history of the city from the earliest times to 324 A.D. Pp. xlv + 437; 13 plates, 3 maps. Oxford: Blackwell, 1938. Cloth, 25s.
- Catholic University of America Patristic Studies.** Vol. LIII. The Rare and Late Verbs in St. Augustine's De Civitate Dei. By M. B. Schieman. Pp. xvii + 85. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1938. Paper, \$2.
- Cesareo (E.)** Le orazioni nell' opera di Sallustio. Pp. iv + 113. Palermo (published by the author at Via Catania N. 15), 1938. Paper, L. 70.
- Cesareo (E.)** Tibullo. Elegie. Con introduzione e commento. Pp. xx + 89. Florence: Le Monnier, 1938. Paper, L. 8.

- Cooke (H. P.) and Tredennick (H.) Aristotle, The Organon, I. The Categories, On Interpretation, by H. P. C.; Prior Analytics, by H. T. Pp. vii + 542. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1938. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Cooper (A. F.) Latin Revision Course. Pp. viii + 127. London: Bell, 1938. Cloth, 2s.
- Costas (P. S.) An Outline of the History of the Greek Language, with particular emphasis on the Koine and the subsequent periods. Pp. 143. (The Eurasiatic Library of America. Origines Eurasiaticae II. Series Historico-philologica. Vol. VI. Chicago: Ukrainian Academy of Sciences of America, 1936. Paper.
- Dioniso. Bollettino dell' Istituto Nazionale del Dramma Antico. Vol. VI—nn. 4-5. Syracuse, 1938. L. 10.
- Dörrie (H.) Passio SS. Machabaeorum, die antike lateinische Uebersetzung des IV. Makkabäerbuches. Pp. viii + 147. (Abh. d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist.-Kl., 3. Folge, Nr. 22.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1938. Paper.
- Donnelly (F. P.) Literature, the Leading Educator. Pp. xv + 278. New York and Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1938. Cloth, 93s.
- Dornseiff (F.) Der sogenannte Apollon von Olympia. Zweite Auflage. Pp. 45. Greifswald: Dallmeyer, 1938. Paper.
- Duckett (E. S.) The Gateway to the Middle Ages. Pp. xiii + 620. New York: Macmillan Company (London: Macmillan), 1938. Cloth, 21s.
- Duff (P. W.) Personality in Roman Private Law. Pp. xiii + 241. Cambridge: University Press, 1938. Cloth, 15s.
- Durry (M.) Les cohortes prétoriennes. Pp. 454; 12 plates, 1 plan. (Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, Fasc. 146.) Paris: Boccard, 1938. Paper.
- Durry (M.) Pline le jeune: Panegyrique de Trajan. Préface, édité et commenté par M. D. Pp. 275. (Collection d'Etudes anciennes. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1938. Paper, 50 fr.
- Ehrenberg (V.) Alexander and the Greeks. Translated by R. Fraenkel von Velsen. Pp. vii + 110. Oxford: Blackwell, 1938. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Etudes de Papyrologie. Tome quatrième. Pp. 233; 5 plates. Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1938.
- Excavations at Olynthus. Part VIII. The Hellenic House. A study of the houses found at Olynthus, with a detailed account of those excavated in 1931 and 1934. By D. M. Robinson and J. W. Graham. Pp. xxiii + 370; 36 illustrations, 110 plates. (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 25.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1938. Cloth, 67s. 6d.
- Fankhänel (H.) Verb und Satz in der lateinischen Prosa bis Sallust. Eine Untersuchung über die Stellung des Verbs. Pp. 273. (Neue Deutsche Forschungen, Band 182.) Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1938. Paper, RM. 10.
- Fehl (P.) Die interpolierte Recension des Terentextes. Pp. 152. (Neue Deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Klassische Philologie.) Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1938. Paper, RM. 6.50.
- Floersheim (C.) Collected Poems. Poems; translations from the Greek Anthology; epigrams. Pp. xxiii + 443. Hove, Sussex: Combridges, 1938. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Frank (T.) An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome. Edited by T. F. Vol. IV. Roman Africa—R. G. Collingwood. Roman Syria—F. M. Heichelheim. Roman Greece—J. A. O. Larsen. Roman Asia—T. R. S. Broughton. Pp. vii + 950. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1938. Cloth, 22s. 6d.
- Fuchs (H.) Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt. Pp. 102. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1938. Stiff paper, RM. 5.
- Gaffiot (F.), Boulanger (A.) Cicéron. Discours. Pour le poète Archias: texte établi et traduit par F. G. Pour L. Flaccus: texte établi et traduit par A. B. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1938. Paper, 20 fr.
- Garstang (J. B. E.) Agrippina. A Story of Imperial Rome. Pp. viii + 103. London: Bell, 1938. Limp cloth, 1s. 9d.
- Giusti (A.) Omero, Odissea, Libro VI. Introduzione, commento e indici analitici di A. G. Pp. viii + 71. Turin: Lattes, 1938. Paper, L. 5.
- Goodenough (E. R.) The Politics of Philo Judaeus. Practice and Theory. With a General Bibliography of Philo by H. L. Goodhart and E. R. G. Pp. xii + 348; frontispiece. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1938. Cloth, \$3.75 (17s.).
- Greindl (M.) ΚΛΕΟΣ ΚΤΑΟΣ ΕΥΧΟΣ ΤΙΜΗ ΦΑΤΙΣ ΔΟΞΑ. Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung des epischen und lyrischen Sprachgebrauches. Pp. viii + 161. Lengerich i. W.: Lengericher Handelsdruckerei, 1938. Paper.
- Guéraud (O.) et Jouguet (P.) Un livre d'écolier du III^e siècle avant J.-C. (Publications de la Société Royale Égyptienne de Papyrologie, Textes et Documents II.) Pp. 60. Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1938. Paper, P.T. 50.
- Henry (P.) Etudes plotiniennes. I. Les états du texte de Plotin. Pp. xxviii + 426. Brussels: L'Édition Universelle (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer), 1938. Paper, 100 frs. belges or 20 belgas.
- Hermathena. No. LI. Pp. 179. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, and Co. (London: Longmans), 1938. Paper, 6s.
- Hesperia. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. VII: No. 2. Pp. 161-310; figures and plates. Athens: American School of Classical Studies, 1938. Paper.
- Il Limes Romano. I. Vulic (N.) Il limes romano in Jugoslavia. Pp. 16. L. 2. II. Sticotti (P.) Il limes delle Alpi Giulie. Pp. 28. L. 3. III. Stade (K.) Il limes romano in Germania. Pp. 23. L. 3. IV. Paulovics (S.) Il limes romano in Ungheria.

- Pp. 20. L. 2. V. *Willem Vollgraaf* (C.) Il limes romano nei Paesi Bassi. Pp. 17. L. 2. VI. *Poidebard* (A.) Il limes romano in Siria. Pp. 19. L. 2. VII. *Schober* (A.) Il limes romano in Austria. Pp. 15. L. 2. IX. *Richmond* (I. A.) I limites romani nella Britannia. Pp. 21. L. 2. Maps, figures and plates. Rome: Istituto di Studi Romani, 1937-8. Paper.
- Jaeger* (W.) *Demosthenes: The Origin and Growth of His Policy*. Pp. x+273. (Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. 13.) Cambridge: University Press, 1938. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Janssen* (H.) *Kultur und Sprache. Zur Geschichte der alten Kirche im Spiegel der Sprachentwicklung. Von Tertullian bis Cyprian*. Pp. xi+265. (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, Fasc. 8.) Nymegen: Dekker en van de Vegt, 1938. Paper, fl. 3.25.
- Kendrick* (T. D.) *Anglo-Saxon Art to A.D. 900*. Pp. xxiii+227; 25 figures, 104 plates. London: Methuen, 1938. Cloth, 25s.
- Kent* (R. G.) *Varro on the Latin Language, with an English translation. In two volumes. I. Books V-VII*. Pp. 1+367. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1938. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Kern* (O.) *Die Religion der Griechen. Dritter Band: Von Platon bis Kaiser Julian*. Pp. vii+352. Berlin: Weidmann, 1938. Paper, M. 18 (bound, 20).
- Kuiper* (W. E. J.) *Het origineel van Plautus' Epidicus*. Pp. 67. Amsterdam: Swets en Zeitlinger, 1938. Paper, fl. 1.20.
- Lämmli* (F.) *Das attische Prozessverfahren in seiner Wirkung auf die Gerichtsrede*. Pp. 167. (Rhetorische Studien, 20. Heft.) Paderborn: Schöningh, 1938. Paper, M. 9.
- Le Grandi Strade del Mondo Romano. I. Gremier* (A.) *Le strade romane nella Gallia*. Pp. 29. II. *Todorov* (Y.) *Le grandi strade romane in Bulgaria*. Pp. 33. III. *Goessler* (P.) *Le strade romane in Germania*. Pp. 39. L. 4. IV. *Viollier* (D.) *Le strade romane della Svizzera*. Pp. 22. L. 2. V. *Dobias* (J.) *Le strade romane nel territorio cecoslovacco*. Pp. 30. L. 3. VI. *Strong* (E.) *Viaggio attraverso le strade della Britannia romana*. Pp. 29. L. 3. VII. *Byvanck* (A. W.) *Le strade romane nei Paesi Bassi*. Pp. 18. L. 2. VIII. *Breuer* (J.) *Le strade romane nel Belgio*. Pp. 31. L. 3. IX. *Levi* (D.) *Le grandi strade romane in Asia*. Pp. 23. L. 3. X. *Panaitescu* (E.) *Le grandi strade romane in Romania*. Pp. 23. L. 3. XI. *Nagy* (L.) *Le grandi strade romane in Ungheria*. Pp. 11. L. 2. XII. *Vulic* (N.) *Le strade romane in Jugoslavia*. Pp. 14. L. 2. XIII. *Romanelli* (P.) *Le grandi strade romane nell'Africa settentrionale*. Pp. 26. L. 3. Maps, figures and plates. Rome: Istituto di Studi Romani, 1937-8. Paper.
- Livingstone* (R. W.) *Portrait of Socrates. Being The Apology, Crito, and Phaedo of Plato in an English translation with introductions and notes*. Pp. lvi+200. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Cloth, 6s.
- Marchant* (E. C.) and *Watson* (G.) *New Latin Course*. Pp. xi+211; illustrations. London: Bell, 1938. Cloth, 3s.
- Marmorale* (E. V.) *Giovenale*. Pp. 157. Naples: Ricciardi, 1938. Paper, L. 10.
- Marouzeau* (J.) *L'Année philologique. Bibliographie critique et analytique de l'antiquité gréco-latine. Publiée sous la direction de J. M. par J. Ernst. Tome XI. Bibliographie de l'année 1936 et complément des années antérieures*. Pp. xxiv+447. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1938. Paper, 75 fr.
- Müller* (K. A.) *Claudians Festgedicht auf das sechste Konsulat des Kaisers Honorius herausgegeben und erklärt*. Pp. 131. (Neue Deutsche Forschungen, Band 176.) Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1938. Paper, RM. 6.
- Nestle* (W.) *Der Friedensgedanke in der antiken Welt*. Pp. 79. (Philologus, Supplementband XXXI, Heft 1.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1938. Paper, M. 7.25.
- Nixon* (P.) *Plautus, with an English translation. In 5 volumes. V. Stichus, Trinummus, Truculentus, Vidularia*. Pp. ix+368. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1938. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Pace* (B.) *Arte e Civiltà della Sicilia antica. Volume secondo: Arte ingegneria e artigianato*. Pp. vii+528; 371 figures. Milan etc.: 'Dante Alighieri', 1938. Paper, L. 50.
- Page* (T. E.) *Virgil, Aeneid IX. Edited for the Use of Schools by T. E. P. With Vocabulary by G. H. Nall. Pp. xxviii+136; illustrations. (Elementary Classics.)* London: Macmillan, 1938. Cloth, 2s.
- Pfeiffer* (R.) *Die Netzfisher des Aischylos und der Inachos des Sophokles. Zwei Satyrspiel-Funde*. Pp. 63. (Sb. d. Bayerischen Akademie d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Abt., Jahrgang 1938, Heft 2.) Munich: Beck, 1938. Paper.
- Picciotto* (S.) *'Perseus et Andromeda'. The Chancellor's Prize for Latin Verse Composition, 1938*. Pp. 10. Oxford: Blackwell, 1938. Paper, 2s.
- Pohlens* (M.) *Hippokrates und die Begründung der wissenschaftlichen Medizin*. Pp. 120. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1938. Cloth, RM. 6.
- Przychocki* (G.) *De Menandri comici codice in Patriarchali Bibliotheca Constantinopolitana olim asservato. Accedunt tabulae II et catalogus Bibliothecae*. Pp. 45. (Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Archiwum Filologiczne NR 13.) Cracow etc.: Gebethner and Wolff, 1938. Paper.
- Raskin* (G.) *Handelsreclame en soortgelijke praktijken bij Grieken en Romeinen*. Pp. xv+144. (Katholieke Universiteit te Leuven, Philologische Studiën, Teksten en Verhandelingen Nrs 13-15.) Louvain (Brabant) connestraat, 88, 1936. Paper, 28 fr.
- Rattenbury* (R. M.), *Lumb* (T. W.), *Maillon* (J.) *Héliodore, Les Ethiopiques (Théagène et Chariclée). Tome II. Texte établi par R. M. R. et T. W. L. et traduit par J. M.* Pp. vii+370. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1938. Paper, 40 fr.
- Reinhardt* (K.) *Das Parisurteil*. Pp. 31. Frankfurt a.M.: Klostermann, 1938. Paper: export price, RM. 1.31.
- Revista Clasică*. Tom. VIII. 1936. Pp. 180.

- Bucarest : Institutul de Studii Latine (Paris : 'Les Belles Lettres'), 1938. Paper, Lei 200.
- Riefstahl (H.) *Der Roman des Apuleius*. Pp. 133. Frankfurt a.M. : Klostermann, 1938. Paper : export price, RM. 6.
- Roberts (C. H.) *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*. Volume III. Theological and Literary Texts (Nos. 457-551). Pp. xvii+217; 10 plates. Manchester : University Press, 1938. Cloth.
- Roloff (H.) *Maiores bei Cicero*. Pp. 153. Göttingen : Dieterichsche Universitäts-Buchdruckerei, 1938. Paper.
- Roma nell' *Opera del Genio*. I. A. Bruers : *Roma nel Pensiero di Gioberti*. Pp. 16. II. F. Orestano : *Roma nell' Opera di G. B. Vico*. Pp. 16. III. A. Marpicati : *Roma nell' Opera del Petrarca*. Pp. 19. IV. G. Bellonci : *L'Idea di Roma nell' Opera di Carducci*. Pp. 18. V. C. Formichi : *Roma nell' Opera di Shakespeare*. Pp. 15. VI. G. Bellonci : *Roma nelle Opere di Corneille e di Racine*. Pp. 18. IX. A. Bruers : *Roma nel Pensiero di Gabriele d'Annunzio*. Pp. 21. Rome : Istituto di Studi Romani, 1937. Paper, L. 2 each.
- Ros (J.) *Die METABOAH (variatio) als Stilprinzip des Thukydides*. Pp. xxiv+512. (Rhetorische Studien, Ergänzungsband I.) Paderborn : Schöningh, 1938. Paper, RM. 14.
- Rouse (W. H. D.) *The Story of Achilles*. A translation of Homer's 'Iliad' into plain English. Pp. xii+504. London etc. : Nelson, 1938. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Sachs (C.) *World History of the Dance*. Translated by B. Schönberg. Pp. xii+469; 32 plates. London : George Allen and Unwin, 1938. Cloth, 20s.
- Salanitro (N.) *Tibullo*. Pp. 193. Naples : Loffredo, 1938. Paper, L. 32.
- Sanford (E. M.) *The Mediterranean World in Ancient Times*. A volume in the Ronald Series in History. Pp. xxi+618; 65 plates, 11 maps. New York : Ronald Press Co., 1938. Cloth, \$4.50.
- Schadewaldt (W.) *Homer und die homerische Frage*. Pp. 22. (From *Die Antike*, XIV.) Berlin : de Gruyter, 1938. Paper, RM. 1.80.
- Scharf (J.) *Studien zur Bevölkerungsgeschichte der Rheinlande auf epigraphischer Grundlage*. Pp. 174. (Neue Deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Alte Geschichte.) Berlin : Junker und Dünhaupt, 1938. Paper, RM. 7.70.
- Scheps (N.) *Sedulius' Paschale Carmen*, Boek I en II, ingeleid, vertaald en toegelicht. Pp. 185. Delft : Meinema, 1938. Paper.
- Schmitz-Cronenbroeck (W.) *Die Anfänge der Heroinden des Ovid*. Pp. 40. Düsseldorf : Nolte, 1937. Paper.
- Simenschy (Th.) *Toxaris (Despre prietenie) traducere din limba elină*. Pp. 37. Chişinău : Tiparul Moldovenesc, 1938. Paper, 20 Lei.
- Smail (W. M.) *Quintilian on Education*. Being a translation of selected passages from the *Institutio Oratoria* with an introductory essay. Pp. xlviii+144. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1938. Cloth, 4s. 6d.
- Stœncker (W. G.) *Celsus. De Medicina*. With an English translation. In three volumes. II, III. Pp. lxvii+291, v+357. (Loeb Classical Library.) London : Heinemann, 1938. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) each.
- Stanford (W. B.) *Traces of Sicilian Influence in Aeschylus*. (Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, XLIV C 8.) Pp. 229-240. Dublin : Hodges, Figgis and Co., 1938. Paper, 1s.
- Steffen (V.) *Satyrographorum graecorum reliquiae. Collegit disposuit praefatione annotationibusque criticis instruxit V.S.* Pp. xxxi+479. (Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk.) Poznań : Jachowski, 1935. Paper.
- Stuart (M.) *The portraiture of Claudius : preliminary studies*. Pp. xiv+95. New York (Columbia University), 1938. Paper.
- Stumpo (B.) *Il fanciullo miracoloso dell' ecloga IV di Virgilio*. Pp. 111. Amatrice : Tipografia dell' Orfanotrofio Maschile. Paper, L. 5.
- Sylloge *Nummorum Graecorum*. Vol. III. The Lockett Collection. Part I : Spain-Italy (gold and silver). 684 figures, and letterpress. London : Milford, 1938. Paper, 15s.
- Tarn (W. W.) *The Greeks in Bactria and India*. Pp. xxiii+539; 1 plate, 1 pedigree, 3 maps. Cambridge : University Press, 1938. Cloth, 30s.
- Tersaghi (N.) *Lineamenti di storia della letteratura greca*. Pp. vii+292. Turin etc. : Paravia, 1937. Paper, L. 15.
- Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*. Vol. LXVIII, 1937. Pp. v+506+cxvii. To be ordered through the Lancaster Press, Lancaster, Pa., or Blackwell, Oxford. Paper.
- Untersteiner (M.) *Erodoto, Le Storie*, Libro nono. Introduzione e commento di M.U. Pp. 273. Milan and Rome : 'Est', 1938. Paper, L. 12.
- van den Bruiwaene (M.) *La théologie de Cicéron*. Pp. xxi+267. (Université de Louvain : Recueil de travaux publiés par les membres des Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie, 2^e Série, 42^e Fascicule.) Louvain : Bureaux du Recueil, 1937. Paper, fr. 50.
- Vergilius. *The Bulletin of the Vergilian Society*. Number 1. Pp. 46. Paper. (See p. 113).
- Wilson (L. M.) *The Clothing of the Ancient Romans*. Pp. xiii+178; 95 plates. (The Johns Hopkins Studies in Archaeology, No. 24.) Baltimore : Johns Hopkins Press (London : Milford), 1938. Cloth, 22s. 6d.
- Woodhouse (C. M.) *Greek Elegiac Verse*. A Translation of Pope's *Sappho to Phaon*, Ll. 179-End. (Gaisford Prize.) Pp. 9. Oxford : Blackwell, 1938. Paper, 2s. 6d.
- Wörter und Sachen*. Zeitschrift für indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft, Volksforschung und Kulturgeschichte. Neue Folge, Band I, Heft I. Pp. 80; 32 plates, 1 map. Heidelberg : Winter, 1938. Paper, RM. 6.
- Zeller (E.) *La Filosofia dei Greci nel suo Sviluppo storico*. Parte I. I Presocratici. A cura di R. Mondolfo. Vol. II. Ionici e Pitagorici. Pp. 719. Florence : 'La Nuova Italia'. Paper, L. 56.